REPORTER'S RECORD
CAUSE NO. C1-CV-25005339

[redacted]	§	IN THE COUNTY COURT
	§	
VS.	§	AT LAW NO. 4
	§	
JOHN ROBERTSON	§	TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS

HEARING ON APPLICATION FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER

JANUARY 23, 2026

On the 23rd day of January, 2026, the following proceedings came on to be heard in the above-entitled and numbered cause before the Honorable Dimple Malhotra, Judge presiding, held in Austin, Travis County, Texas;

Proceedings reported by machine shorthand.

A P P E A R A N C E S

FOR THE PETITIONER:

MICHELE L. LOCKE
SBOT NO: 240369791
COLDWELL BOWES, LLP
2901 Via Fortuna, Terrace 6, Suite 450
Austin, Texas 78746
Telephone: (512) 472-2040

FOR THE RESPONDENT:

GEOFFREY PURYEAR
SBOT NO: 24054396
COFER & CONNELLY
602 W. 11th St.
Austin, Texas 78701
Telephone: (512) 991-0576

I N D E X

January 23, 2026	PAGE
Appearances	2
Case Called	6
OPENING STATEMENTS	
By Mrs. Locke	9
By Mr. Puryear	13
PETITIONER'S CASE	
1st Witness, [redacted]	
Direct Examination	17
Cross-Examination	75
Redirect Examination	138
RESPONDENT'S CASE	
1st Witness, John Robertson	
Direct Examination	150
Cross-Examination	188
CLOSING STATEMENTS	
By Mrs. Locke	215
By Mr. Puryear	217
Court's Ruling	221
Court in Recess	224
Reporter's Certificate	225

EXHIBIT INDEX

APPLICANT'S EXHIBITS	ADMITTED
Applicant's Exhibit 1	19
Applicant's Exhibit 3	53
Applicant's Exhibit 7	51
Applicant's Exhibit 9	54
Applicant's Exhibit 10	55
Applicant's Exhibit 11	55
Applicant's Exhibit 12	55
Applicant's Exhibit 13	55
Applicant's Exhibit 15	59
Applicant's Exhibit 17	59
Applicant's Exhibit 19	59
Applicant's Exhibit 20	59
Applicant's Exhibit 21	59
Applicant's Exhibit 31	64
Applicant's Exhibit 32	64
Applicant's Exhibit 33	66
Applicant's Exhibit 34	66
Applicant's Exhibit 36	66
Applicant's Exhibit 38	69
Applicant's Exhibit 43	149
Applicant's Exhibit 45	72
Applicant's Exhibit 46	215

EXHIBITS (cont'd.)

	ADMITTED
Applicant's Exhibit 47	138
RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS	
Respondent's Exhibit 1	95
Respondent's Exhibit 2	110
Respondent's Exhibit 3	110
Respondent's Exhibit 4	112
Respondent's Exhibit 5	176
Respondent's Exhibit 6	177
Respondent's Exhibit 7	177
Respondent's Exhibit 8	177
Respondent's Exhibit 9	177
Respondent's Exhibit 10	177
Respondent's Exhibit 11	177

(In open court.)

THE COURT: Let's go on the record in Cause Number C1-CV-25-005339. This is an application for order of protection in the name of [redacted] listing the respondent as John Robertson.

If I can have both sides please state your appearances for the record?

MRS. LOCKE: I am Michele Locke and Caitlin Boland on behalf of [redacted]. We're ready to proceed, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. PURYEAR: And Geoffrey Puryear on behalf of John Robertson, the respondent. Ready to proceed, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. And are there any preliminary matters that we need to address at this time?

MRS. LOCKE: A couple of preliminary matters, Your Honor, just housekeeping. We have a motion to appear electronically for one of the custodian of records from a doctor's office.

THE COURT: Okay.

MRS. LOCKE: We've been trying to subpoena them for two weeks and they said it was difficult and having to deal with attorneys, but they have agreed to

Format

make their records available electronically, so we did file a motion for that. We also filed a motion as it relates to sealing the medical records in this case.

The Court -- there have been two subpoenas, one was issued by opposing counsel and they obtained mental health records of our client without a release. We have concerns about, based on the history of the parties and the history of this case, that information being disclosed. And so we'd like that any medical records that get admitted into evidence be put under seal. And so we filed a motion for that as well.

THE COURT: Okay. And Mr. Puryear, let's take up the first motion to appear electronically and that was for the custodian of records. Any objection?

MR. PURYEAR: I have, I guess, a clarification, Your Honor? The doctor who -- whose office prepared those records, there is some matters of, I think, potential credibility and impeachment that may be difficult, kind of just given the confines of electronic testimony, but I'm happy to attempt to navigate those and we can take those up if they come up.

THE COURT: Okay.

MRS. LOCKE: And Judge, to clarify, it is solely the custodian of records to authenticate the records because the records speak for themselves. We

are not anticipating calling the doctor.

THE COURT: All right. That motion will be granted.

MRS. LOCKE: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. With respect to the second motion to seal the medical records? Any objection, Mr. Puryear?

MR. PURYEAR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. That motion is granted as well.

Anything else that we need to take up at this time?

MRS. LOCKE: I think that's it for preliminary.

THE COURT: Given that I've granted the first motion for the custodian to appear electronically, in terms of timing because we're going to need to generate a Zoom link and provide that to you, to both parties, so when were you intending on calling this witness in terms of the order?

MRS. LOCKE: After I call my client.

THE COURT: Okay.

MRS. LOCKE: And I would assume that on break, opposing counsel and I can talk about whether those records can just come in just for purposes of

authenticity is why we're having the custodian of records, but we can discuss that on a break.

THE COURT: Sure, okay. So -- and then just looking at the time, I would imagine that we would probably take a break around noon, just a lunch break, and then resume at one o'clock?

MRS. LOCKE: That works for me.

THE COURT: Okay, all right. And are there any witnesses in the room?

MRS. LOCKE: I don't have any witnesses in the room.

THE COURT: Okay, all right. Okay.

And Mrs. Locke, do you wish to make any opening remarks at this time?

MRS. LOCKE: Briefly, Judge, if the Court would allow?

THE COURT: Please, of course.

MRS. LOCKE: Thank you.

This case has been pending, Judge, since August 21st of 2025. And it's a protective order based on sexual assault as well as stalking and harassment. And we'll get into the issues of what has occurred, but to give the Court some background, these parties are streamers.

Foreign concept to me. I've learned more

about that in the last couple of months than I ever thought I would. They have an immense amount of following. And I think Mr. Puryear, at our continuance hearing on the extension, mentioned and made reference to the parties being like the Brad and Angelina, but of like the Twitch streaming that they do for online gaming. And the parties have a relationship.

The Court will hear details of the sexual -- the nature of the sexual relations between the parties that gave rise to the claims of sexual assault. What the Court will also hear evidence of how it came that my client, [redacted], came to live with opposing party, Mr. Robertson. It was kind of a bait and switch.

It was, Hey, come here and help me with my social media and move in. You can live rent free. And when she moved in, it became, Oh, well, you need to give me oral sex to compensate for your rent. So you're going to hear some information about coercive control. You're going to hear that he recorded her without her consent in sexual acts. You're going to hear, Judge, that he would demean her by having her write "slut" and "cum here" on her face before he made her perform oral sex.

What you're also going to hear about this case, Your Honor, is that they had never actually

engaged in traditional intercourse. It was only ever he received blow jobs and there was never any reciprocation on to my client. In addition, there was never any really kissing. He would want to spit in her mouth, but she refused. And so you're going to hear a lot about -- and I think what you will hear, Judge, is that my client -- and the evidence will show that my client had been raped before, a pretty ugly rape in her early 20s, and knew what that was.

Didn't understand, until she got out of this relationship, how bad it was. And then what you will see, Judge, is that he used his platform from the time they broke up until the Court signed that emergency protective order in August of '25, that he went on a consistent rampage against her on social media. The Court will recall at the last hearing the Court said, I will caution the parties to stay off social media, especially as it relates to this case. And Mr. Robertson, that day, went and posted something about the case.

And so what you will see is his consistent threats on social media wherein he has told the audience of over a million subscribers that he suffers from schizophrenia, that he has delusions at least once a month, but they're relatively controlled. He has also

said in additional social media posts that he will take her down, that he will expose the truth. He goes on rampages about women, et cetera. And what my client and the evidence will show is that since this protective order has been in effect, my client has had peace for the first time since they broke up because he has, for the most part, been retained in what he's allowed to do online.

And the concern is based on his own statements to his streamers -- and we have the videos, Judge -- that if the protective order goes away, that my client's life will turn into a nightmare again. My client is on the spectrum for autism and suffers from some anxiety disorder. I -- it's a really unfortunate case. And what is difficult about it is because both of these parties earn their living from social media and streaming, that any affect that he puts on social media and then the threats, they get back to her. They -- he knows they get back to her and he knows that it can affect her business.

And the Court will hear a little bit of details of how the online streaming works and compensation, but it was very much she thought if she left him, that all of her social media and all of her income would go away. But at the end of the day, we're

asking the Court to grant a protective order for the appropriate time period this Court determines under the statutory authority and orders attorney's fees in connection with the granting of a protective order.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mrs. Locke. Mr. Puryear?

MR. PURYEAR: Thank you, Your Honor.

Judge, just very briefly, I think what the Court is going to hear, what the Court is going to see for itself in documentation that will be offered, and my expectation will be admitted, is that that summation of the relationship could not be farther from the truth. I think what you will hear is that the applicant was the one that reached out to Mr. Robertson to begin a relationship, and that a romantic relationship was begun in December of 2022.

And that romantic relationship progressed, as many do, and they moved in together. It's true that the applicant never paid rent. What I think you're going to hear is that Mr. Robertson had a male roommate who didn't pay any rent either. Mr. Robertson has been fortunate in his finances. He makes pretty good money doing what he does and he is happy to accommodate friends, romantic relationships in that way. There was never any quid pro quo associated with it.

Now, they were certainly intimate, as people in a relationship are, and I think you're going to see evidence of the nature of that relationship and how consensual it was. It's my expectation you're also going to hear about a police report that was filed in February of 2024 by the applicant against Mr. Robertson's ex-wife, [redacted]. And the nature of that police report was that the applicant believed that John's ex-wife was recording them in their intimate interactions with each other.

You're going to hear that that was the nature of the police report, that at that point in February of 2024, you know, a year and a half into their relationship, she never made any claims that these alleged recordings contained evidence of sexual victimization or that they contained any evidence that John had been abusing her. Further, she never made any outcry to Officer Hoffman with the Leander Police Department that she was a victim, that she was a survivor, that John had abused her sexually or in any other way. Further, you're going to hear that the applicant filed a lawsuit against John's ex-wife in Williamson County.

And the nature of that lawsuit was that -- centered around these alleged recordings that John's

wife had made from cameras that were installed in the house when they were married. You're going to hear that in this lawsuit, the applicant details lies that had been told by John's ex-wife online, very similar to the allegations in this case. The applicant made some bold proclamations online to her followers and then followed up with this lawsuit.

You're going to hear that among the lies that she details in this lawsuit, that John's ex-wife was allegedly spreading online, was that she was John's sex slave, that she was being groomed to be his sex slave. And she unequivocally says those statements are lies, they are not true. In fact, she characterizes those as disgusting lies. You're going to hear that that lawsuit was filed the end of June in 2024, a month after the last detail of sexual abuse she mentions in her application for a protective order.

So you're going to hear less than a month after the May 28th/May 29th incident that she discloses in the application for a protective order, she's filing this lawsuit saying that the notion that she is a sex slave or she has been groomed to be his sex slave is a disgusting lie. You're also going to hear that she was admitted to Austin Oaks about a month after she files this lawsuit, at the end of July of 2024.

And you're going to see for yourself in writing that the intake staff at Austin Oaks asked her about her history of sexual victimization. And they asked specifically, [redacted]? Six months being the span that covers both of the specific allegations in the application for a protective order. And she says, [redacted].

They go on to ask with more specificity, [redacted]? And she says, [redacted]. A time period that preceded any interaction between the parties at all. You're going to be able to see that for yourself in writing in addition to -- my expectation is that you're going to see text messages, communications between the parties. It's going to give you better context on the nature of their relationship, one that was purely romantic, one that ran its course and one that ended, unfortunately, because of the applicant.

So it's my expectation at the end of all the evidence the Court is going to have no reservations denying the application for protective order, and we're going to ask you respectfully to do so.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Puryear. Mrs. Locke, please call your first witness.

MRS. LOCKE: I call my client, [redacted].

THE COURT: All right. [redacted], if you'll please have a seat on the witness stand, make yourself comfortable and I will swear you in.

(Witness sworn in.)

THE COURT: Go ahead.

[redacted],

Having first been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MRS. LOCKE:

Q. Will you please state your name for the record?

A. [redacted].

Q. And [redacted], you are the applicant in this protective order application. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And at the time that you filed this application for protective order, were you a resident of which county?

A. I was -- Williamson County at the time.

Q. Okay. And does Mr. Robertson live in Travis County?

A. I believe at that time he did.

Q. Okay. And the -- at the time you were living with Mr. Robertson, were you all living in Travis County?

A. I believe so.

Q. Okay. And so the acts that took place that you've alleged in your protective order took place in Travis County. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. And you are seeking a protective order against Mr. Robertson. Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Can you tell the Court why?

A. He has relentlessly harassed me and threatened me and threatened to ruin my life. It's just been -- it's been a nightmare. I've been having to get therapy for all of the, obviously, sexual assault and things he's done. And I would like to move on and live my life and not have to be consistently afraid of things he's doing or threatening me and I just want to move on and stop being scared.

Q. Okay. And in your application for protective order, you signed a declaration. Do you recall that?

A. Yes.

MRS. LOCKE: And Judge, forgive me, I have not practiced in front of you before. I have digital and I have paper and I don't know if you would -- how you would like me to present because I've got -- my client needs to see some of the evidence we're going to introduce. If you want me to do it electronically, but

I do have a paper copy for you.

THE COURT: Paper's fine. Are you talking about the actual declaration?

MRS. LOCKE: Yes, the actual declaration.

THE COURT: I do have that.

MRS. LOCKE: Well, Judge, I'm going to move to introduce Applicant's Exhibit 1, which is the actual application for protective order with the declaration that is attached thereto.

THE COURT: All right. Any objection, Mr. Puryear?

MR. PURYEAR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Applicant's 1 is admitted.

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) [redacted], that is the application that you, in fact, filed. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. Can you turn to the page where your declaration starts, which is -- I can help you out with that -- Page 5?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. When did you -- let's give the Court little bit of background.

What is it that you did at the time for a living when you met Mr. Robertson?

A. At the time, I was a fairly small streamer and I did GTA role play online, so like voice acting and storytelling with other streamers.

Q. What is GTA?

A. Grand Theft Auto.

Q. Okay. And so when you say you were a small -- a smaller streamer, can you qualify -- quantify that for the Court in terms of what's a large streamer versus a small streamer?

A. A large streamer would have around 5,000 viewers consistently. Mine was maybe 200, but I think at the time I had less than 100,000 followers at the time -- I'm sorry -- 500.

Q. By 500, you mean 500,000 followers?

A. Sorry, sorry. Less than 100,000 at the time on Twitch.

Q. At the time that you met Mr. Robertson, how many -- and they're called followers. Is that correct?

A. Yeah.

Q. How many did he have at the time that you met him?

A. I think almost one million.

Q. All right. And what was it that Mr. Robertson did at the time that you met him?

A. He would play Got You games, which is like

Chinese gambling games, like with Anime girls and characters, like that.

Q. Okay. And is that how Mr. -- how did Mr. Robertson earn income at the time, to the best of your knowledge?

A. I believe he was making $100,000 a month.

Q. And that was from doing what in particular, if you know?

A. He was streaming the games and then he was also part of the very large gaming organization called One True King. They had basically all the largest streamers in Austin and, you know, like they had a lot of control over the space.

Q. Okay. And just because I don't know, is Austin a large market for streamers?

A. It has a large market for some of the largest streamers.

Q. Okay. And what are some -- and this is a -- it's OTK. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. And was Mr. Robertson a member of OTK?

A. Yes.

Q. And were you a member of OTK?

A. Absolutely not.

Q. Okay. Why not?

A. I was way too small, a nobody in that sense.

Q. Okay. The people that were -- belonged to OTK, how many followers did those particular individuals have?

A. Millions.

Q. Millions, okay. And was Mr. Robertson at that level of millions?

A. I believe he was on his way, yes.

Q. All right. And when -- how did you meet Mr. Robertson?

A. My -- I had a friend that recommended I reach out to him because we were supposed to, I guess, have some lunch thing. And he's like, He also likes Anime, you should reach out, he seems really cool. And so I reached out on Twitter and he wanted to hang out right away. And we began a friendship.

Q. Okay. And you heard opposing counsel indicate that you had pursued him and wanted to get into the relationship with Mr. Robertson. Was that accurate?

A. No.

Q. All right. Tell the Court what is the accurate version of that, of you-all getting together.

A. I told him I did not want to date at the time, I would never date a streamer. That's why I was currently

on online dating apps, because I just wanted to date a little bit outside. I tried talking to somebody in the streaming space, I wasn't really sure about it. And he then had me sit in his bathroom one time and had like a very emotional conversation and kind of used that as leverage to, you know, convince me to try dating him.

Q. Okay. And how did it go from convincing you to dating him to you moving in together with him?

A. He told me, he said, I could change your life. I'm in OTK, I have connections. You should just move in with me. You won't have to pay rent and I will help you and you try to help me. He's like, I'll get you -- here's some vitamins and was like, I'll change your life and we'll get you better, and kept telling me that he's going to change my career.

Q. Okay. And is it a big deal belonging to OTK?

A. Absolutely. It's huge.

Q. Okay. Just so the Court understands, why is that?

A. Because they have pretty much control in Austin to make and break your career, whether you get invited to collaborations or get sponsorships. They also have control and the owners own one of the largest management companies that I was also part of at the time or he got me into it because that was another promise he said he

could do.

Q. Okay. And do you know what Mr. Robertson's role in OTK was?

A. He was a core member.

Q. He was a what?

A. Core member.

Q. What's a core -- what does that mean?

A. Well, just like the main members, like, that represent the organization.

Q. Okay. So what was your understanding of the authority that Mr. Robertson had within OTK?

A. Like, he got invited to everything. He could get you into parties, he could get you into collaborations. And then, obviously, he was working with Mythic Talent and could get you into Mythic Talent. And that's huge if you're wanting to get money and sponsorships.

Q. Okay. What is Mythic Talent?

A. It is -- I believe Mr. Robertson has a part of -- or some type of ownership in it and another member owns it. It's just like a management, media management, where they manage creators and give them sponsorships and collaborations.

Q. And what promises, if any, did Mr. Robertson make to you about your career if you moved in with him?

A. He said he could come on my stream, like it will

be a good dynamic, you know, having a -- what he explained to me having a hot cosplay girl living in his house.

Q. And what was the arrangement that you had before you moved in with regards to rent?

A. I just would help him with some thumbnails. So in my assumption, it would just be helping him because I do graphic design and media, so I like make his thumbnails and edited some things for him.

Q. Just so the Court -- so the record is clear, what are thumbnails?

A. So when he posts things like YouTube videos, like I'd go in Photoshop and create a graphic design for him.

Q. Okay. And at some point, did the arrangement for rent change?

A. It changed after we moved in to Chestnut Ridge.

Q. Okay. And what changed?

A. It went from, Make this thumbnail for me, to -- he kept telling me to suck his dick. And at that time, he would tell me, Do your job, you don't pay rent. And those are the words that I clearly remember.

Q. Okay. And how soon after -- and Chestnut was in Austin, Texas. Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. And how soon after you moved in to the Chestnut

address did that -- those activities start occurring with Mr. Robertson?

A. Pretty right away. He -- I didn't have any inclinations of, like, issues until we moved into that home.

Q. Okay. And how soon after you moved in did those issues begin?

A. Pretty right away. I think once he had said that in particular, I felt disgusted. And then told him I wanted to pay rent, and that's why soon after towards the end of -- I believe it was the end of February, I started paying rent. I gave him one thousand dollars. said I didn't like that dynamic, it made me feel disgusting.

Q. Okay. And so do you recall when you moved in to that address?

A. I believe early -- earlier February.

Q. And that would've been of 2023 or 2024?

A. 2023.

Q. Okay. And so he made that demand, then you said no and started paying rent?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. And you started paying rent, can you recall when?

A. I believe February '23.

Q. Okay. And did you consistently pay rent until you moved out of the residence?

A. Yes, it wasn't consistent. He changed the pricing a lot.

Q. Okay. What was the highest amount rent you paid to him?

A. $4,000.

Q. $4,000?

A. Yes.

Q. What were the circumstances that he raised your rent from $1,000 to $4,000?

A. He told me that I would be moving in to the next home and started having me pay double rent when I started making more money.

Q. Were there any demands for sexual acts when that rent went up as well?

A. I believe at the time it was more of an obligation.

Q. You mean the sex was an obligation?

A. (Witness nods head.)

Q. Can you describe what you mean for that to the Court?

A. Like for example, after I had my breast surgery and I couldn't, like, do it for him, he would get very upset because I had to lay up straight. Am I allowed to

talk about that situation?

Q. So let's -- we'll talk about that in just a second.

A. Sorry. I was --

Q. So hang on.

You suffer from what? Anxiety. Right?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And you were also -- is it on the spectrum?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. And when you were taking breaths, you were trying to calm yourself down. Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So let's talk about what happened with -- when did you get your breast augmentation?

A. I believe I did it late of 2023, and then I had to get it redone in 2024, earlier in 2024.

Q. All right. And in August of 2023, was that the incident you were just talking about?

A. Yes, it was in May of 2024.

Q. Okay. So it was after your revision?

A. This was the revision part that this incident occurred.

Q. Okay. So in May of 2024, tell the Court what happened.

A. I was lying in my bed and I -- you know, my doctor told me that I had to sit up straight. Like, I can't lie down or to the side or anything because I still had stitches and I was still taking heavy medication. And he was getting very unruly, like, and upset that I couldn't give him blow jobs during my healing period.

Q. Okay. So when you said he would get upset and unruly, can you describe for the Court what he would actually do?

A. He'd be, like, So you think you can suck my dick? Or he was just very -- seemed very annoyed I guess is a good word for it, very annoyed. And in this incident, I was laying in bed and he's, like, Do you think you could still suck my dick? And I was like, I told you I can't. Like, the doctor said I have to lay up straight, so I'm going to lay up straight. And I'm like, No, not right now, I'm really sorry I can't do that for you. Because I felt -- he made me feel bad about it.

Q. What happened next?

A. He then grabbed my shoulders and put me over his stomach and then began jerking off on to my face and told me to stick my tongue out until he came on my face.

Q. And did you consent to him doing that?

A. No. I told him, I can't. I think after that

point, I think he was just kind of in shock, like I think it -- there's just circumstances that I say no and I assume that's enough, to say no, that I can't.

Q. Did it cause you any physical pain, that incident?

A. I was under a lot of medication, but I think I was just scared that it was going to mess up any of the stitches I currently had healing.

Q. Okay. Had there been another incident like that before when you had had some kind of cosmetic procedure and he required you to do the same action?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. When was that, if you can recall?

A. Do you mind if I look --

Q. You have your affidavit.

A. Thank you.

Q. It's been introduced into evidence, if you need to review that.

A. Okay. I can't recall -- I think the last incident, I got it mixed up with this date because I read the date.

Q. Okay.

A. So I believe this one was in May.

Q. Okay. So May of what?

A. 2024.

Q. All right. And so what happened in May of 2024?

A. I had just got my lips done. They were very swollen and painful, like you could still see the injection sites. And he asked me to suck his dick and I said, no, that it would ruin my lip injections because, you know, if you don't let them settle, it will migrate.

And he's like, Oh, but it's really hot. It's really hot when they're swollen like that, they look all big and fat. And I'm like, I can't, because it's going to mess up my face. And he then -- we were -- because this happened when we were lying in bed. He then put my face -- he made me suck his dick.

Q. Okay. When you say that he made you, I know this is difficult, can you describe to the Court the actions he took to force you to do so?

A. He grabbed the back of my head and slowly put it to his dick and told me open my mouth and suck his dick.

Q. Okay.

A. And he also made public comments about this as well, that I believe is in my timeline.

Q. Okay. We'll get to the public comments in a minute, but did you end up having issues with your lip filler after this incident?

A. Yes. So because he did that, it did migrate and I complained to him multiple times afterwards that what

he did caused the migration. And he's like, Oh, it doesn't look that bad. It's not a big deal is what he would say.

Q. And what did you have to have done, if anything, to correct that?

A. I had to get them dissolved and then fixed.

Q. Let's talk a little bit about the relationship -- did you have your own room at the residence?

A. I was paying for one room. And because the other roommate, he would complain that the other roommate wasn't paying rent all the time. So he told me for me -- so I offered to pay for another room to help pay for the rent because he complained about money a lot.

Q. Okay. So did you-all, I guess, cohabitate in the same bedroom?

A. Yes. He had me sleep with him a lot because he always mentioned that with his schizophrenia he was afraid to sleep alone and I felt guilty and bad if I didn't.

Q. Okay. And he has admitted to you that he's schizophrenic?

A. Yes, and publicly.

Q. Okay. He's actually done so his -- on his streams. Right?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you know if at all what medication he takes for his schizophrenia?

A. He said he used take them when he was younger and he didn't like that. I guess it didn't make him himself, so doesn't take them anymore.

Q. And are you aware, and this goes back when you were living together, was he taking any medications that you're aware of for his schizophrenia?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Did you ever have him -- did you ever see him have any schizophrenic episodes?

A. Many.

Q. Okay. And can you describe for the Court what it was like when he would have a schizophrenic episode?

A. He mentioned one time he was driving with his friend Jimmy and he almost crashed his car because he saw somebody behind him, I guess, speaking to him because he sees people walking around as well as he would get scared because he said he'd see versions of myself giving myself suicide around the house.

Q. Versions of you?

A. Yes. And that my face would be melting when he looked at me and it would scare him.

Q. Okay. And he never went and sought psychiatric care to the best of your knowledge?

A. No. I tried to tell him many times, especially because he told me he almost crashed his car and had a lot of these issues where he was consistently afraid or paranoid.

Q. Did you-all, in your relationship, ever have traditional, like, vaginal sex?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Why not?

A. He told me because of trauma. Then he mentioned his ex-wife, but I don't know if I can go into that.

Q. Well, there's an NDA related to that particular lawsuit. Right?

A. Yes, he had her sign NDA.

Q. Okay. So we won't talk about the details of that. But what else did he tell you about why he did not engage in traditional, vaginal intercourse with you?

A. He said his sister molested him when he was younger. And he consistently told me that he was disgusted by vaginas.

Q. Okay. And did you-all ever, like, kiss like a normal relationship?

A. We did hug a lot, but he was not a fan of kissing because he said he had a lot of -- he would get a lot of saliva in his mouth. That's what -- so consistently, anyone who knows him knows him that he spits all the

time when he walks around.

Q. And what did he ask you to do instead of the traditional kissing?

A. Multiple times, he would ask if he could spit in my mouth.

Q. And what was your response to him?

A. No, I personally have a disgust for like spit stuff myself.

Q. All right. And so were there any interactions where he was physical with you to engage in relation that would make you happy?

A. Never.

Q. And so he never -- did he ever -- have his hands ever touched you physically under your pants?

A. Not under my pants, no.

Q. Okay. And so -- and I'm sorry to be explicit, but his hands never touched your vagina. Is that right?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Did his penis ever touch your vagina?

A. Never.

Q. And so the only activity was the blow jobs?

A. Was me giving him blow jobs.

Q. How often would he record you during the blow jobs?

A. I would say about 40 percent of the time.

Q. Okay. And did he do so with your consent?

A. There was, I could say maybe two or three times where he asked and then it got to the point where he just didn't ask. I -- there were times where I didn't like it and I would squint my eyes and he would get upset and delete the recording and then start the recording and he's like, I need you to open your eyes, make noises, stick your tongue out. I -- I don't want to do it, but like make a huffing, like moaning noises. And look at the camera and look like you like it is what he would tell me when he would rerecord again.

Q. And did he do anything else with regards to the oral sex with him that you disliked?

A. I really didn't like cum and so much with the spit thing, just personal trauma I didn't like it. And so he would always want to try to -- like, his goal, I guess, was to get me to swallow his cum a lot. There's a lot -- most a lot of the times I would just gag a lot.

Q. Did you tell him no?

A. I would just tell him I really don't like it and he wanted to make it a goal to get me to do it.

Q. And how did he convey that to you, that he wanted that to -- that that was his goal?

A. He's like, Oh, you know, you just got to keep doing it and you'll get used to it.

Q. Did he ever make you write anything on your face?

A. Yes.

Q. Can you tell the Court about that?

A. He told me to go into the bathroom and I believe that it was a derogatory word of "slut" on my forehead and "cum here" with an arrow pointing to my mouth. And he said if I did that, that we'll have a normal sexual relationship and we'll have normal sex if I did that. And I guess like in my head -- sorry.

In my head, I thought if I did that, we'd just have a normal relationship. Sorry.

Q. It's okay. Take a breath.

A. I'm sorry.

Q. It's okay.

A. I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

MRS. LOCKE: Break, please?

THE COURT: Yes, let's take a recess.

MRS. LOCKE: Thank you, Judge.

(Brief recess.)

THE COURT: Let's go back on the record in this cause. Please proceed, Mrs. Locke.

MRS. LOCKE: Thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (cont'd.)

BY MRS. LOCKE:

Q. So [redacted], he told you that he would -- that

you-all could have a normal relationship if you did that particular act. Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And at any point, did you-all have any normal relationship after that?

A. No.

Q. Okay. At what point did the relationship start to unravel or get close to ending?

A. We had a talk and mutually decided to end it more, I believe, on his side. And then soon after, we had a talk and got back together, and then I ended the relationship later on.

Q. All right. And you-all had discussions -- he would address your mental health. Right?

A. Yes. He always said that my -- whenever I had complaints about how he was treating me or anything, he said my -- because I'm autistic, my version of reality is not like normal people and that he would have to explain to me what was really going on.

Q. And you-all had a journal. Is that right? Or you had a journal?

A. I kind of just started one. He had me write a list of things he said that were wrong with me that he said I needed to give a psychiatrist. And then he later graded me on things he thinks I need to work on.

Q. And what did he say that you needed to go see psychiatrist for?

A. That my memory recollection was incorrect. I believe I wrote it in the journal. I can't remember by specific.

MRS. LOCKE: Okay. I sent you a copy of this, but this is the actual journal.

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) Would seeing the journal help you refresh your recollection?

A. Yes.

MRS. LOCKE: Judge, may I approach?

THE COURT: You may.

MRS. LOCKE: Thank you.

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) Hang on. That's, in fact, the journal that he wrote in. Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. Just review it to refresh your recollection first. I'm actually not going to introduce the journal.

A. Okay. I see it.

Q. All right. Now, do you remember what it was that he was complaining with regards to you and your mental state?

A. He said I was immature, that my memory recollection was incorrect, that my phrasing, that --

you know, he would say things and then I would phrase it incorrectly, that I lacked communication skills, that I was depressed and dooming a lot. That I wasn't a positive person, I didn't take accountability, I was not independent enough, I was paranoid and I had no emotional control.

Q. Did he accuse you of being schizophrenic?

A. It felt like it at times.

Q. Okay. And what are your actual, like sitting here today, your mental health diagnoses?

A. I am autistic as well as have anxiety disorder.

Q. Okay. You've not been diagnosed with bipolar disorder?

A. I was misdiagnosed and correctly diagnosed with autism, and I was diagnosed with autism twice by psychiatrists and medical professionals.

Q. Okay. So they replaced the bipolar with the autism spectrum disorder?

A. That was a primary care doctor. He just gave me like, Oh, I think this is what you might have, but it wasn't a psychiatrist. And then I went to see a psychiatrist and got correctly diagnosed.

Q. And you -- there's been discussion of a hospitalization that you had. Do you recall that?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. And you went to Austin Oaks. Right?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you do so voluntarily or were you forced to go?

A. I think because of the situation I was in, I just wanted to get out. I think because of the list he gave me, I went to an online doctor, told them that -- the list of things that he told me to tell her and she gave me medications that made me just shake and I -- because obviously, I'm not schizophrenic or anything, so it doesn't work for me. And I just -- I just needed to get out. I needed to get out of the house.

Q. When you did that online appointment, was he there with you when you did that online appointment?

A. No, but he had me write the list of what I needed to tell her.

Q. Okay. And what medications did that doctor prescribe?

A. I believe it was [redacted].

Q. And did that work for you in any way?

A. No. I tried to tell him, Oh, it's great, it's fine, but I would tell my assistant, I was like, This is making me shake. I don't like the way this makes me feel.

Q. Are you currently taking it?

A. Absolutely not.

Q. Okay. And so the Austin Oaks, where did you go after -- let me back up a little bit.

How long were you at Austin Oaks?

A. Three days.

Q. Okay. And what were your discharge instructions?

A. Just [redacted]. I can't remember what it was, but instead I decided to go ahead and see a therapist.

Q. Okay. And did you actually have any acts of, like, did you intentionally self harm or --

A. No.

Q. So what was the reason you went?

A. I just needed to get out of the house. I -- I think at the time I was just confused. Like, I knew something in my gut was wrong, like how I was being treated, but, you know, he was telling me otherwise. And I was just confused and I just -- I told -- I called my sister, I said, I just need to get out. I just need to see somebody. I need to get out of this place.

I calmly packed up my clothes, told my roommate, Hey, I'm going to be leaving, I'm not feeling good. And then my sister drove me. I went there, they said, Hey, there's nothing we can really do, you're fine. But if you want, you can admit yourself to get evaluated.

Q. Okay. So did you self admit?

A. Yes.

Q. And when you were discharged or left Austin Oaks, did you go back into the same residence with Mr. Robertson?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Where did you go after that?

A. I went to my mom's. I did go to his house to collect items that -- when he wasn't there. And that's when I confided in my -- at the time his roommate that, I, guess that was going to be moving in. I said, I'm afraid of him, I'm really scared, I'm going to go ahead and stay at my mom's because I can't be here.

Q. And you heard opposing counsel indicate in opening that you didn't make any reference to Mr. Robertson being abusive when you went to Austin Oaks. Do you recall him saying that?

A. I'm sorry?

Q. I'll rephrase.

Do you recall opposing counsel, in his opening statements, making comments that you didn't mention anything wrong about Mr. Robertson when you were at Austin Oaks?

A. Yes. I remember.

Q. Okay. When was it that you first realized that

what was going on was what is sexual assault?

A. It was after I moved my stuff out and I talked to an online friend and I felt safe enough to speak to someone about what -- the events that had occurred.

Q. Okay. And have you had contact with law enforcement regarding these allegationg?

A. Yes.

Q. When did you make contact with law enforcement?

A. I -- do you mind if I look?

Q. You can look at your affidavit.

MRS. LOCKE: Judge, may I retrieve the journal?

THE COURT: You may.

A. I believe it was around January '25. I do believe it was early the next year, I just can't remember the exact date of when we went into the --

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) Okay. But did you file a criminal complaint?

A. Yes. I filed a police report.

Q. And what is the current status of that?

A. Because of the harassment, I had to suspend it.

Q. Okay. They wanted -- what did law enforcement want you to do with regards to a phone call to Mr. Robertson?

A. A preliminary call.

Q. Okay. And was it a pretext call?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. And what was your understanding of what you were supposed to do on that phone call?

A. Call him and get him to talk about the things he did to me.

Q. All right. And were you able to do so?

A. No, because he was threatening me and harassing me publicly and I was scared.

Q. Okay. We'll get to that in a second.

But you did not follow along with what law enforcement wanted you to do?

A. No, I did what was recommended by the counselor that was there with me.

Q. All right. And so around the same time, did Mr. Robertson start posting on -- what was it? Is it Twitter or is it X? I don't know.

A. It was Twitch, YouTube and Twitter. He did it on all three.

Q. And starting in January of 2025, what did he start doing with regards to the online platforms?

A. He started before then. He started, I believe -- I believe around November, he started the threats in 2024.

Q. And what kind of threats was he making online?

A. I have a timeline of everything.

Q. Okay.

A. But it was mainly, I'm going to sue you, I'm -- he's also made threats that he's going to ruin me, that everybody was going to know the truth, that he was coming after me, that -- also, that there were explicit material that he shared with multiple people and that he will post them online if I don't retract statements. And it's just -- it is almost 200 pages of it.

Q. And you actually asked him to do -- when you first broke up, what did you actually ask him to do with regards to the videos?

A. I asked him multiple times in multiple circumstances, Please delete any sexual footage you have of me because I knew that some of it was not consensual. And he would make collages of my videos and things like that and it was very disturbing. I didn't want him to have access to them.

Q. Sitting here today, do you know if he has deleted all those videos?

A. I do not know. He's told me he would and then the last time I requested, he just did not respond.

Q. Okay. So sitting here today, you have no idea if he still has those videos in his possession?

A. Yes, I'm not aware if he does or not.

Q. Are you concerned about what he will do if he has those?

A. Yes.

Q. And what are your concerns?

A. He'll either post them publicly, continue to share them with more people, as he had stated, and possibly -- I just -- I don't want that. I don't think anybody wants that.

Q. Has he threatened you with putting that out there?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. How has he done so?

A. I don't have the exact verbiage. It is in the timeline of what he said in his words.

Q. Okay. Did you have to contact an attorney in early 2025 with regards to what was going on online?

A. Yes. It had just gotten very overwhelming because no one wanted to associate with me because he was attacking me. He had attacked them as well.

Q. Okay.

A. And I -- I was just -- I was becoming very isolated. I kind of had to rebuild my friend group, my -- with my family. Sorry. What was the question?

Q. That's okay. What was going on online that gave you to the point where you had to hire an attorney back

in early 2025?

A. Oh, yes. Even after going to the police, he still would not stop harassing me and I had an attorney send him a cease and desist telling him I had gone to the police and he needs to leave me alone.

Q. Did that stop him?

A. No. In fact, he went publicly and laughed about it and said, She's -- she sent me a cease and desist for defaming her, but I'm going to keep defaming her.

Q. Okay. And that was February 6th of 2025, he posted a live stream on Twitch?

A. I'm not sure of the exact date that he did that.

Q. Okay. Has he made threats about going nuclear when the legal situation between you and he ends?

A. Yes. And I believe it was the time he was like showing his guns and things.

Q. Okay. And in fact, he's indicated on social media that he's schizophrenic and is strapping, referring to weapons. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Tell the Court your concerns about his use of -- or I'm sorry, his possession of firearms.

A. I'm afraid that if he does, obviously, with the threats he gets so upset, that he will try to do something to me, especially because I do go to

conventions and public things, or if like he has an episode or anything and is upset enough.

Q. And you filed this on the protective order. So you first contacted an attorney in January, went to the police in January of 2025. Why is it that you filed the protective order application in August of 2025?

A. Well, first, it was mainly just dealing with the police and the preliminary call and trying to get that set up and whether that was the right move to do for my safety. And so it kind of just kept getting pushed between the police and then his threats.

Q. And he, in the lawsuit --

MRS. LOCKE: I'll ask the Court to take judicial notice of the filing of the application for protective order which was August 21st of 2025.

THE COURT: Yes, the Court will do so.

MRS. LOCKE: May I approach the witness?

THE COURT: You may.

MRS. LOCKE: Thank you.

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) I'm going to show you what we've marked as Applicant's Exhibit 7. Are you able to identify that?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Without telling what's in it yet, the statements in it, what is it?

A. A tweet from Robertson, Mr. Robertson.

Q. Okay. What does Mr. Robertson go by on -- go by on his social media?

A. TECTONE.

Q. And that's -- can you spell it for the court reporter, please?

A. Spell it?

Q. Yes, for the court reporter.

A. T-E-C-T-O-N-E.

Q. All right. And what is it that you go by online?

A. Pinkchyu.

Q. Can you spell that for the court reporter?

A. P-I-N-K-C-H-Y-U.

Q. All right. And that is a true and accurate copy of the message that he put out on his social media on August 25th of 2025. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And when you read this, did you note this related to you?

A. Yes.

Q. And how do you know that was related to you?

A. This was many of his multiple times where he's named me or not named me or it was times where I sent the cease and desist or have gone to the police and he would make statements like this.

Q. All right. And this is a true and correct copy of this, you've not changed or modified it in any way. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

MRS. LOCKE: Judge, I move to introduce Applicant's 7.

THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Puryear?

MR. PURYEAR: Relevance, Your Honor? I don't -- I mean, this could be about anything. I don't understand what the relevance this has to the proceedings in front of the Court. I don't think that those dots have been connected sufficiently, but that -- that would be my objection.

THE COURT: Your objection is relevance, it's overruled. Applicant's 7 is admitted.

MRS. LOCKE: Thank you.

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) What was it that TECTONE published four days after this application for protective order was filed?

A. I'm not sure of the dates correctly.

Q. I'm sorry?

A. What are the dates?

Q. Can you zoom in? Do you say -- I'm sorry. 8/22/2025. And this was the day after the application was filed. Is that right?

A. I believe so.

Q. Okay. And you've received extensions of this ex parte protective order that was granted back in August. Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. All right.

MRS. LOCKE: Judge, may I approach the witness?

THE COURT: Of course.

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) [redacted], I'm going to show you what's been marked as Applicant's 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13. Will you look at those, please?

A. Yes, I see.

Q. Let's start with -- those are all -- like the last exhibit, Exhibit 7, those are all various screen shots of TECTONE posting. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. And just to lay the foundation, you've not changed or modified these in any way. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. These are true and correct copies of the social media posts that TECTONE, Mr. -- A/K/A Mr. Robertson published. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And 9 is from 9/16/2025. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. And there's an extension of this protective order signed back in -- on September 3rd. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. And it was -- that paperwork was extended until December 3rd of 2025. Is that correct?

A. I believe so, yes.

MRS. LOCKE: Judge, I would ask the Court to take judicial notice -- I'm sorry, I apologize for not standing, Judge -- the Court take judicial notice of the agreed order for extension of temporary ex parte protective order. I've marked it and will move to introduce it as Applicant's Exhibit 3.

THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Puryear?

MR. PURYEAR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Applicamt's 3 is admitted.

MRS. LOCKE: May I approach too with the court reporter?

THE COURT: You may.

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) Let me lay the foundation on all of them. So that was a true and correct copy of the post that he put on 9/16 of 2025?

A. Yes.

Q. And did you believe this one to be about you?

A. Yes.

Q. Why?

A. Any time there was an extension or something, he had something to say.

MRS. LOCKE: Okay. Judge, I move to introduce Applicant's Exhibit 9.

THE COURT: Are you moving to introduce 9 through 13 or just 9?

MRS. LOCKE: I want to lay the foundation for 9 so I'm just going one by one, Judge. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: No problem. Mr. Puryear?

MR. PURYEAR: No objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: 9 is admitted.

MRS. LOCKE: Can you go to 10, please?

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) And 10 was posted on September 22nd, 2025?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. And you have not changed or modified this in any way. Is that correct?

A. No.

Q. It's a true and correct copy of the post that TECTONE, A/K/A Mr. Robertson posted on or about that date?

A. Yes.

Q. And this -- and this was related to something involving you. Correct?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. And that's how you believed it to be?

A. Yes.

MRS. LOCKE: All right. Judge, I move to introduce Applicant's Exhibit 10.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. PURYEAR: Judge, opposing counsel provided these to me. I don't have any objection to any of these.

THE COURT: Okay. Applicant's 9 through 13 are admitted without objection.

MRS. LOCKE: Thank you, Judge. And thank you.

MR. PURYEAR: Yeah.

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) So let's go to A11. What does Mr. Robertson tell to his followers on 9/23/2025?

A. If you think $10,000 is a lot to start vtubing, you should see how much women spend on plastic surgery to start OnlyFans or OF.

Q. OF stands for OnlyFans?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you have an OnlyFans account?

A. Yes.

Q. When did you create your OnlyFans account?

A. I believe towards the end of December of 2024 -- 2024.

Q. All right. So Mr. Robertson knew you had an OnlyFans account?

A. He encouraged me to make one.

Q. Okay. And -- but you are not doing any nudity on your account. Is that correct?

A. I do not do full nudity.

Q. All right. And he encouraged you to do so?

A. We agreed that I did not do full nudity.

Q. Okay. But he is the one who encouraged you to do --

A. To make an OnlyFans. I had a Fansly account at the time. OnlyFans is more stigmatized and kind of can hurt your career more than just having a Fansly.

Q. Okay. And what -- do you know what the reference to the 10K to start YouTubing is, what that reference is to?

A. To make a VTuber model.

Q. I don't -- I'm so sorry. I'm just a lawyer.

A. To make a graphic for your streaming.

Q. Oh, okay. All right. Let's go to 12. What does Mr. Robertson post to his audience again around the same

date, September of 2025? Can you read that, please?

A. I made a post about this earlier and I'm going to need to say it again. Do not date crazy chicks. No, you will not fix them. No, it will not be worth it. Yes, it's fucking stupid. It's like inviting a rabid dog into your house. Sure, they might be cute, but that thing got rabies and going to kill your ass. You won't have a partner, you'll have a liability. And if you don't stoop to their delusions, they'll turn against you and make you their next target. Find yourself a nice girl or a guy that you can communicate effectively with, not an adult with a mind of a deranged psychopath.

Q. Was there any doubt who this referred to in your mind?

A. It was me.

Q. Okay. And how did you know it was you?

A. He said multiple times with my name, specifically stating my name on stream and publicly that I was crazy.

Q. All right. Let's go to 13.

Are these the types of messages that you found to be harassing?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And were these the types of messages that your attorney requested he stop doing in the cease and desist?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. Let's go to A13.

Tell me this. Do you do a little bit of like Anime? Is that what you do? Like, you dress up as cosplay as Anime characters?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So back in October 3rd of 2025, so two months after the protective order had been filed and the ex parte had been granted, what did he post on his socials?

A. Do not put your dick in crazy. It's hot in Anime, stupid as fuck in real life.

Q. What else did he say about mental illness?

A. You cannot -- you can't fix a mental illness, Bro. You can medicate it, but that's a crap shoot. Get someone who you don't need to fix. Much easier.

Q. All right. Did you have any doubt these were about you?

A. No.

Q. I'm --

A. No, I had no doubt it was about me.

Q. Okay. And did you -- how did your fans, if at all, because I don't know how this works, how did you learn that he was talking about you on social media?

A. People in my community would let me know and tag

me and at me. My friends, people in the space, because it did affect my livelihood and my consistent life because people who worked with me would be technically associated with somebody he's consistently attacking, and they were afraid that he would also attack them as well.

Q. All right. And he -- let's go to 13. I'm sorry, 14 is correct.

A. I don't believe I have that page. But I can see it on the screen.

Q. I'm sorry. That will be these ones. 15 through 21, I think.

MRS. LOCKE: May I approach, Judge?

THE COURT: You may.

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) I'm going to show you Applicant's Exhibits 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21.

MR. PURYEAR: No objection to these, Your Honor.

THE COURT: No objection, all right. Applicant's 15 through 21 are admitted.

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) All right. Start with 15.

And this is Mr. Robertson, on Applicant's 15, actually referring to your allegations. Is that right?

A. I believe so, yes.

Q. All right. And what does he say?

A. They're going to hate what I found today. Your loss is now even more inevitable. Now, I wait.

Q. Okay. And when you see these messages that he posts like this, how did you interpret them? Like, how did it make you feel?

A. Like he's coming after me.

Q. Okay. And then let's go to 16.

So the same month, October of 2025, so shortly after the protective order was filed, what does TECTONE, Mr Robertson post yet again about this?

A. Another OnlyFans woman lying about rape, then just moves on. No damage done to them. Ruin a man's life for three years. Why is this so common?

Q. And did you believe that this -- what was also related to you in a way?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And why did you believe so?

A. He -- what he does is he gets -- basically trains his community into hating OnlyFans or women or also migrants and things like that. I'm half Mexican. And just things to hate about women and women that have OnlyFans. So when he does attack me, that they're more angry towards me.

Q. Now, have you had some of his fans come after you in these platforms?

A. Oh, absolutely.

Q. Can you explain that to the Court, please?

A. I've had people make threats, YouTube videos, calling me a liar, a whore, threatened to want to kill me. I believe also I've had a DM somebody threaten to rape me. Basically, it had gotten to the point where I didn't even go to TwitchCon because I was afraid maybe one of his fans might try to physically hurt me.

Q. Does Mr. Robertson know that his -- or let me rephrase that.

Has he told you previously about how he can get his fans to do what he needs them to do?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Can you tell the Court what he has told you with regards to that?

A. It was in the situation with his ex-wife. After their -- he had her sign the NDA, he wanted me to go after her. May I give context?

Q. I don't want to go into what is -- the issues in the NDA.

A. Okay.

Q. Just answer the question, what he told you specifically about having his fans to do things.

A. Yeah, that if you kind of guide them into the right direction, that they'll know who to attack and

he's done it to multiple, multiple people.

Q. And how have you seen him do it to multiple people?

A. Enviosity was one example. He has a lot of, I guess, beef with a lot of people. I can't even count. In his YouTube videos, he names each of his YouTube videos after the person he's going after in that video.

Q. And what is your concern with regards to what happens if this protective order is not granted after this hearing today?

A. He is going to continue, as he's shown before, relentlessly harassing and threatening me to the point where I will probably have to take measures where my life may be in danger.

Q. A17, he posts in October of 2021, what does he post?

A. Proud to be blocked women who falsely accuse men are scum and should be in prison.

Q. Are you falsely accusing him of these actions?

A. Absolutely not.

Q. Okay. Did they, in fact, take place?

A. Yes.

Q. A19, what did Mr. Robertson say -- and this was actually before the protective order was filed on June 18th of 2025.

A. I'm excited to be called misogynistic for thinking women are smarter than people believe and that the bad actors who lie and scream, I was manipulated are going to make it harder for real victims to be taken seriously.

Q. Did you think this post related to you?

A. Yes, because he's already said publicly that I ruined it for other victims.

Q. He said you specifically?

A. Yes, he made a tweet with my name specifically speaking about me.

Q. All right. Let's go to 20, please.

On October 27th, 2025 what did he post?

A. To all the OnlyFans whores trying to give me life advice, bro, I can see your asshole for less than buying a Fortnite Battle Pass. Shut the fuck up.

Q. Is this how he would refer to women in front of you?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Let's go to 21. All right.

And then on, it looks like again in October of 2025, what does Mr. Robertson say?

A. Who will be the next OnlyFans girl to call me out? Bot their likes, then lock the comments. Holy fuck. Absolutely rent free in their minds. Get back to

making your family shameful of your existence.

Q. And did you believe that was referencing you?

A. It was possibly, just kind of like I said, getting his audience to have a certain view for when he attacks me.

Q. And then it was set for court, I think, in December. Correct?

A. Yes.

Q. One of the extensions?

A. Yes.

Q. All right.

MRS. LOCKE: May I approach, Judge?

THE COURT: You may. Do you have any objections to 31 to 32?

MR. PURYEAR: No.

THE COURT: Applicant's 31 and 32 are admitted.

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) There was an agreed order for an extension of a PO on 1/23 of 2025. Is that your understanding or recollection?

A. Yes.

MRS. LOCKE: Judge, I would ask the Court to take judicial notice of the agreed order of extension of protective order that was signed on 1/23 of 2025.

THE COURT: The Court will do so.

MRS. LOCKE: All right. I would ask the Court to take judicial notice that it was originally set for hearing -- not originally.

The extension was set for December 3 of 2025, but it was extended the day before because the parties agreed to extend it.

THE COURT: Yes, that's right. And the Court will take judicial notice.

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) Shortly after that extension, did Mr. Robertson post again on social media?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. And in fact, on December 12 of 2025, in Exhibit 31, what did he post?

A. You got no idea how hard it is to find a woman that isn't a psychotic entitled cunt. Men got it hard.

Q. All right. And do you think -- did you take that as directed towards you?

A. Yes.

Q. Why?

A. It is the same verbiage that he's used multiple times when describing me.

Q. And describing you publicly or in private?

A. I believe he just calls me crazy and psycho is what I believe he said on his streams about me.

Q. All right. We'll pull up 32. And then on

December 17th of 2025, what does he post?

A. No, we do, but modern feminism have convinced women that a man wants to protect you is manipulating you. Women have grown ungrateful and entitled and expect to be taken care of and protected, but aren't willing to do their part of the relationship and they say you're abusive.

Q. And that was all while there was that emergency protective order in place. Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. How did this compare to what the -- what he had posted before the protective order? Like what's the difference between --

A. Very tame.

Q. Okay. And what were the ones like before?

A. He explicitly named me and gave it lots of threats.

Q. All right.

MR. PURYEAR: No objection.

THE COURT: All right. That was Applicant's?

MRS. LOCKE: 33, 34 and 36.

THE COURT: All right. 33, 34 and 36 are admitted.

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) Back on December 20th of 2025, so

a month ago, what else did Mr. Robertson post while this ex parte was in effect?

A. Any woman that lies about SA, sexual assault, or rape, should be punished to the fullest extent of the law. They should be excommunicated from every group they're a part of, and people knowingly weaponizing their lie should be held accountable as well.

Q. And then on 34, on 12/30/2025, what did Mr. Robertson post?

A. Lying women have far too much power today.

Q. Did you believe that was in reference to you?

A. Yes.

MRS. LOCKE: And then, Judge, I'll ask the Court to take judicial notice of the extension of the protective order that went into effect until January 7th.

THE COURT: The Court will do so.

MRS. LOCKE: We had a hearing on the 6th about the extension of it.

THE COURT. That's correct.

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) All right. And so I'm going to show you A36. And this was posted on January 6th, 2026 at 7:17 p.m. after we had court that day. Do you recall this tweet?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. And what does he say?

A. I have --

Q. Sorry. What does he say?

A. I'm a patient man. No matter how long this takes, I don't care. Justice will come. I will not fall off. I will return to my life soon. And in the meantime, I'll keep living, working on myself and growing. I'm not worried. I'm looking to the future patiently.

Q. And what did -- how did you take that post?

A. He's treating this as some type of criminal court case rather than me needing protection because of his harassment and threats and the abuse.

Q. And what -- are you asking the Court to grant the protective order?

A. Yes, please.

Q. Okay. And are you asking the Court to prohibit him from going within 200 yards of your residence or place of employment?

A. Yes.

Q. And are you asking that he be prohibited from engaging in any conduct, either online or otherwise, that would harass, annoy, alarm, abuse, torment or embarrass you?

A. Yes.

MRS. LOCKE: Judge, I've got some video that I just need to queue up. So I could take a break.

THE COURT: Why don't we do that? Let's take a ten-minute recess.

MRS. LOCKE: Thank you, Judge.

(Brief recess.)

THE COURT: Mrs. Locke, please proceed.

MRS. LOCKE: What I'm going to show, Judge, is the clip from what is A38, so Applicant's 38, which we will move to admit in its entirety. We are not going to show it in its entirety, but have a clip set up. Any objections?

MR. PURYEAR: No objection.

THE COURT: All right. A38 is admitted.

MRS. LOCKE: Permission to publish?

THE COURT: You may.

MRS. LOCKE: Thank you.

(Video played.)

MR. PURYEAR: Actually, Judge, I should clarify, I haven't viewed this. I don't have any objections to authenticity. I should reserve objections to content; but for time's sake, I'll lodge those objections if they're necessary.

MRS. LOCKE: I understand.

THE COURT: Okay, no problem.

(Video played.)

DIRECT EXAMINATION (cont'd.)

BY MRS. LOCKE:

Q. And this was done on -- that was published on May 12th of 2025. Do you recall seeing that stream?

A. I didn't see the stream. I saw the clips afterwards that were posted online.

Q. Okay. And these were the clips that were posted specifically -- did you think these specifically related to you?

A. Yes, he was speaking about my case.

Q. Al1 right. And what are your concerns about -- if any, about his comment of going nuclear?

A. That was just based off the police report and so that's why he was publicly anticipating and consistently attacking me. Sorry. Can you repeat the question?

Q. Sure. When he said -- what were your concerns about what he would do, if anything, when he talked about going nuclear?

A. Possibly -- most likely post the revenge porn, obviously, threaten and harass me more. And that's when I got really scared that it might get to the point where it will get dangerous for me to even leave my home.

Q. Okay. And were there -- let me back up a little bit.

Have these types of posts continued post the granting of the temporary ex parte protective order?

A. Yes, a lot.

Q. Okay. Are they as descriptive as these particular posts?

A. Yes.

MRS. LOCKE: All right. And this, Judge, is August 16th of '25. It's Applicant's Exhibit 45. Like we've indicated before, we'll provide the entire of the recording to the court reporter. We're just going to show a segment today.

THE COURT: Okay.

(Video played.)

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) And that was published right around the time of the protective order application was filed. Is that right?

A. I believe so, yes.

MRS. LOCKE: Okay. I'll move on to another one, Judge. We're going to show another portion and we're going to mark it as Applicant's 46, Judge, which is --

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. PURYEAR: Again, I --

THE COURT: At least to authenticity.

MR. PURYEAR: At least to authenticity, to

the last clip, I guess I don't. I don't understand what the relevance of any of that was. Worrying about being killed, schizophrenic, I just -- I understand the desire to -- well, I'll strike that.

I just don't know how this applies to what we're here for.

THE COURT: Okay. How does this -- how was that -- I think that was Applicant's 45, how was that relevant?

MRS. LOCKE: Sure, Judge. One of the issues at stake is he's got an untreated mental health condition. It's schizophrenia. It's pretty serious. He carries firearms. He bragged about it online and that gives her concerns for her safety considering the continued pattern that he has; in addition that he's paranoid about her, and admits to seeing hallucinations that he's admitted to publicly online to over a million streamers that he's got following him. It gives real concerns for her personal safety and grounds for the protective order to be granted.

THE COURT: All right. Objection overruled. Applicant's 45 is admitted.

MRS. LOCKE: All right. And this one is from January 14th of 2025.

(Video played.)

MRS. LOCKE: Judge, I'm trying to move to the next part, but my -- it's not time stamped.

(Video played.)

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) All right. When you listen to that, what -- what did you know him -- what did you know him to be referring to?

A. Me.

Q. Okay. And how did you know it was you?

A. He's talking about our case.

Q. Okay. And this was done in January of 2025?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And is this the kind of content that has been harassing to you?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And tell the Court what it does to you when he posts this kind of content.

A. It's degrading. It's scary. It's embarrassing. Like, I don't think anybody wants somebody consistently just calling them these things publicly for everyone, their family, their friends, my colleagues, everyone to hear on a consistent basis.

Q. And did he ever -- I'm sorry.

And do you believe that he is doing this intentionally, knowing it's going to harm you?

A. I believe he is doing this to harm me. And

because I went to the police, he just wants me to let it go, the case.

Q. And is it -- has he engaged in this repeated pattern of making online comments on his streams about you since you went to the police in January of 2025?

A. Even before the police.

Q. Okay. And in fact -- and we won't get into all of it, but you actually created a timeline that has everything that he actually posted on you over the course of?

A. A year.

Q. A year. And it's -- how voluminous is it?

A. Over 200 pages.

Q. And that's just the timeline. Right?

A. Yes.

Q. And do you believe that you will be safe if the Court does not grant this protective order?

A. Absolutely not.

Q. Do you believe that he will engage in a continued pattern of harassment of you if this protective order is not granted?

A. Yes.

MRS. LOCKE: All right. I pass the witness.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Puryear?

MR. PURYEAR: Thank you, Your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. PURYEAR:

Q. [redacted], I'm going to ask you some questions. If I ask you something that's confusing or in any way doesn't make sense, just let me know. Okay?

A. Okay.

Q. And do you go by [redacted]? [redacted]?

A. [redacted].

Q. What's that?

A. I go by [redacted].

Q. [redacted]?

A. It's my middle name.

Q. Is that how you want me to address you?

A. Yes, please.

Q. Okay. All right, [redacted], I want you to take a second. All of those exhibits that your attorney just admitted, can you point out for me where in those exhibits it mentions [redacted], [redacted], Pinkchyu, Pink or [redacted]?

A. In my timeline, there is multiple situations, pages.

Q. [redacted], I want you to take a second and review all of those exhibits. Can you tell me where in those exhibits it mentions [redacted], [redacted], Pinkchyu, Pink or [redacted]?

A. Are you speaking of these printed ones or the ones that were on the screen?

Q. Either.

A. I do not believe in this short clipped section my name was mentioned i n the clipped section.

Q. Okay. I agree with you. Can you point out for the Court any time in any of those admitted exhibits when it mentions [redacted], [redacted], Pink, Pinkchyu or [redacted]?

A. Not that was shown.

Q. Okay. I agree with you. You would agree with me that -- well, strike that.

Has John ever text messaged you since the application -- well, have you ever expressed to John, until the protective order was filed, that you didn't want him to contact you?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. How did you do that? How did you communicate that?

A. From my mom.

Q. Okay. So you had your mom call him and say, She doesn't want you to call anymore?

A. He called my mom.

Q. Okay. And was that conversation recorded in any way?

A. No, but I believe there were --

Q. Was it memorialized in text message in any way?

A. Yes.

Q. In writing?

A. I believe they were in text messages. I don't know if that's when she said it over the phone or through text.

Q. Okay. And I would assume if it's in text, you have a copy of that?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Until the -- strike that.

Since the protective order has been filed, has John text messaged you?

A. No.

Q. Has he e-mailed you?

A. No.

Q. Has he called you?

A. No.

Q. Has he communicated with you by social media?

A. Are you speaking as of -- since the temporary orders?

Q. Facebook Messenger, over direct message on Instagram, any communication at all?

A. My confusion is are you speaking from since the protective order?

Q. Correct. Since you filed the application for protective order and the temporary protective order was granted.

A. No.

Q. Okay.

A. I do not believe so.

Q. Okay. Has he -- have you seen him outside your house in your neighborhood?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Has he approached you?

A. No.

Q. Okay. I want to ask you again, how did your relationship with John start? Who contacted you?

A. I reached out to him because his friend asked me to reach out to him.

Q. Okay. But your friend didn't type out the media message, the social media message to John. Correct?

A. No.

Q. You messaged John. Is that --

A. Yes.

Q. -- correct? Okay.

And when you messaged John, you-all begin a romantic relationship?

A. No.

Q. In December -- what's that?

A. Oh, no. Not when I messaged him, no.

Q. At some point following that message to John, you entered into a romantic relationship, some time between December of 2022 and let's say July of 2024?

A. Yes.

Q. At some point --

A. Yes.

Q. -- you guys were a couple. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Well, I just want to clarify because you provided some testimony on direct that the only reason you slept together was because he was -- he had a mental health diagnosis where he didn't want to sleep alone. I mean, you guys were a couple. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. I just want to clear that up because the implication from that was that you were roommates, but you were only sleeping together because he was scared of the dark or something like that. I mean, you guys were a couple, you slept together in the same bed like couples do?

A. I preferred, a lot of times, to sleep upstairs.

Q. Okay. Have you ever expressed something different in a text message to John?

A. I believe it was over Snapchat. I would tell

him, I'm working or I'm going to sleep upstairs.

Q. Okay. And I'll just say it for purposes of our cross-examination, I'm familiar with the text message history between you guys. I mean, you guys, again, you-all were a couple and you slept in the same bed?

A. Yes, periodically we did. It was both.

Q. Okay. Did you engage in consensual, intimate encounters?

A. There was times before I moved in, yes.

Q. Okay. And I think it's fair to say -- well, strike that.

Your date of birth is [redacted]?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that correct? You made a statement -- well, strike that.

From a personal perspective, do you want partners be invested in your career goals?

A. Supportive.

Q. Okay. Great. Thank you for clarifying.

Do you want them to be supportive of your career goals?

A. Yes.

Q. And John was supportive of you career goals. Is that fair? You testified about him wanting to kind of promote your presence online, to try and help you

achieve more visibility, more popularity, those were all things that you wanted. Is that fair?

A. I think, yes.

Q. Okay. And John was supportive of that?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. If you had a partner that wasn't supportive of your career goals, that wouldn't be a very good sign of a mutually supportive relationship. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. But the inclination on direct was that him wanting you to help you out, that that was a bad thing for whatever reason?

A. It was the dynamic, the power dynamic.

Q. Okay. That he had more fans online and you didn't?

A. He had more control over not just online, but also with companies and stakes in companies and partners.

Q. Okay. And I mean, it could -- correct me if I'm wrong, it sounds like he was leveraging that influence he had in your industry to help your career out. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Was John physically abusive to you?

A. In which way?

Q. Would he hit you?

A. He did shove my head into his crotch one time.

Q. Okay. Would he strike you with his hand?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Would he kick you?

A. No.

Q. Okay. When did this, the alleged sexual abuse, begin?

A. The coercion began when I moved in, and it got more aggressive as time went on.

Q. Okay.

A. When I moved into the Chestnut Ridge Road address.

Q. So is this December of 2022?

A. No.

Q. That's when you guys met?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. When do you think you started dating?

A. I believe a couple of weeks after we met.

Q. Okay. So maybe end of December, beginning of January, something like that?

A. Some time in December. I can't remember.

Q. Okay. And so when did the alleged coercion, when did that begin?

A. When I moved into Chestnut Ridge Road address.

Q. Okay. And I apologize. I don't know when that was. Do you remember like a month and a year?

A. I believe it was possibly February of the next year, of 2024.

Q. February of 2024? Okay. That's when the coercion began?

A. Yes, when I wasn't paying rent and we were into the new home.

Q. Okay. And in your application, you state that around February or March of 2023, you told John that you didn't want to live by this agreement anymore. What agreement was that?

A. I wasn't paying rent. In my perspective, I thought it was because I was going to help him with thumbnails and graphics. And he had stated during intimacy that it was for not that I wasn't paying rent, because I was giving him blow jobs, and he stated, in quotes, Do your job, you don't pay rent.

Q. But it sounds like -- it sounds like you guys were already in a romantic relationship by that point?

A. That's why I was disgusted and confused.

Q. Okay. What was disgusting and confusing?

A. That I thought I was his girlfriend, but he's treating me like a prostitute.

Q. And did you break up with him at that point?

A. I told him I wanted to pay rent. I -- and I hoped it would stop after that. I had already sold all of my items in my home, cancelled my lease, like he asked, and I felt stuck already. And it's not that easy to just move out.

Q. Okay. Did you -- you were -- you were working online. You were, I think, doing some modeling, doing some acting. And I -- again, I am not deeply familiar with kind of this world. But there's -- is that generally what you were doing?

A. I was doing, yeah, streaming and modeling.

Q. Okay. And your income streams from that?

A. It was not as high as it got later when I began an OnlyFans.

Q. Okay. But there was an income stream?

A. Yes, but it was not that high.

Q. Correct. But my question was, there was an income stream?

A. Yes.

Q. And you were making money from that?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And certainly if the situation was coercive enough, if it was bad enough, you could've moved out. Is that fair?

A. No. Because like I said, he does have a lot of power and control and the power dynamic. I just felt like I was just going to start paying rent and, you know, that was going to stop and I was going to hopefully move on from that.

Q. Okay. But John wasn't keeping you in the home. He wasn't physically keeping you in the home?

A. How so? Explain what "physically keeping".

Q. I'll strike that.

And you reported this alleged sexual abuse to the Austin Police Department?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. When was that?

A. I believe it was in early 2025.

Q. Okay. And Detective James Thrift, does that name sound familiar?

A. Yes.

Q. He was the detective assigned. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Would it surprise you if that investigation had been suspended?

A. I suspended it.

Q. You suspended it?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So it was your request to suspend the

investigation?

A. Due to all the threats and harassment, I couldn't do what the officer was requesting for my safety.

Q. Okay. But you proceeded with filing a protective order?

A. Yes. And hopefully after the protective order, if I feel safe and comfortable enough, I will probably most likely reopen the case.

Q. Okay. I want to ask you about another police report that you filed. This one was back in February 12th, 2024 and you called the Leander Police Department. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And at the time of the report, you were residing with John at -- on is it Venezia View? Does that sound familiar?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. At that time, you were residing with John?

A. Yes.

Q. And you made that report because John's ex-wife, Jessica, had messaged John something like, Is she better than me?

A. That is not why I made the police report.

Q. That wasn't my question.

A. Okay.

Q. Did John's ex-wife message him something like that, Is she better than me?

A. That is what he told me. I did not see it.

Q. Okay. But that's what your understanding was, what Jessica told John. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And you made a report on the basis of a suspicion that Jessica had videos of you and John engaged in intimate activities?

A. Yes.

Q. And you believed that she had those recordings?

A. From my -- what I was told, yes.

Q. Okay. From what you were told by who?

A. Mr. Robertson.

Q. Okay. By John?

A. John, yes.

Q. Okay. And you believed what he told you because your next action was to call the police?

A. That was not the timeline of events though.

Q. Correct. It was about 14 months after he told you. Is that fair?

A. It was after multiple people have told me that they were sent that.

Q. After multiple people were what?

A. Stated that they were sent footage.

Q. Okay. Did -- and these multiple people, did they ever provide you any of that footage?

A. No.

Q. Okay. So you don't have any independent evidence or verification that anybody had any footage ever. Is that fair?

A. No, there was some some footage. It just wasn't sexual footage.

Q. Okay. But to be clear, you never saw any video footage?

A. No, I was believing John and his friends.

Q. Okay. When did -- when did Jessica tell -- message that to John, to your understanding?

A. The first time?

Q. Uh-huh.

A. I believe that was in December of 2022.

Q. Okay. And is that when you learned about it?

A. I didn't understand the full context. I just knew it was some footage, something going on, but I didn't understand the full context.

Q. Okay.

MR. PURYEAR: Judge, may I approach?

THE COURT: You may.

Q. (By Mr. Puryear) Have you ever had a different position on that, on when you learned about that

footage?

A. I just was told --

Q. Or that message?

A. -- that it was me giving him a blow job, but I didn't, like, know if it was inside the garage or if it was outside the garage, like, the full context of it because I had never seen it myself.

Q. Okay. Let me back up.

When did you learn about the message that Jessica sent John, something to the effect of, Is she better than me? When did you learn about that?

A. December 2022, he said that she called and said that.

Q. Okay.

A. I believe.

Q. And what did you take from that?

A. I was disturbed.

Q. Okay. Was Jessica there?

A. Jessica where?

Q. Was Jessica in the home when you guys engaged in intimate activity with each other?

A. No, no.

Q. So the implication from that message to John was that she was viewing what you guys were doing in the house someplace else. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Did that concern you?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And you learned about that in December of 2022?

A. Yes.

Q. You didn't report it to the police for some 14 months, until February of 2024?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And on that date, you spoke with Officer Alyssa Hoffman. Do you remember that name?

A. Yes.

Q. And she's an officer with the Leander Police Department. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And you reported to Officer Hoffman that John's ex-wife, quote, had recorded you engage in sexual contact with John?

A. Yes.

Q. And you wanted to file that police report against her because you believed she had been monitoring cameras in the house and recorded you engage in the sexual conduct?

A. It is because she was sending it to multiple people.

Q. Okay. And at that moment when you were speaking with Officer Hoffman, you believed that Jessica still had videos of you and John engaged in intimate activity?

A. Yes.

Q. And I'm sure with Officer Hoffman standing there by your side, with a badge and a gun and handcuffs ready to arrest John, if he had broken the law --

A. It was over -- oh, sorry.

Q. Hold on.

A. My apologies.

Q. You certainly would've told Officer Hoffman, Officer, it's extremely important that we get these videos, not only because Jessica has done something wrong, but these videos contain powerful evidence coerced sexual activity that I've been forced to perform?

A. No.

Q. You probably would have told her, I've been coerced into performing oral sex and these videos will contain evidence of that?

A. May I explain? Sorry. Or --

Q. You can if your attorney asks you, but --

A. Oh.

Q. -- my question is, that's not what you explained to Officer Hoffman. Is it?

A. Those videos did not contain coercion because it was before it began.

Q. Okay. Again, this is in February of 2024?

A. The footage was from December of 2022.

Q. Okay. And you had -- but fair to say, the coercion, according to your testimony had started by then, had started by February of 2024 -- '24?

A. Yes.

Q. And you had every opportunity to tell Officer Hoffman on February 12th that John was sexually abusing you and she could've acted on that. Is that fair?

A. We only spoke through e-mail and specifically about the case.

Q. So Officer Hoffman never responded to Venezia View?

A. No, she did not. I never met her in person.

Q. Okay. She's -- she's sitting outside. She's going to testify. Are you sure that's your testimony?

A. From what I remember, we had gone through e-mail and phone call.

Q. Okay. And if she reduced her interaction with you there at Venezia View to an offense report that was filed, would that be incorrect, if she represents in that offense report that she spoke with you?

A. I just don't remember. I don't know.

Q. Okay.

A. I just remember us going through -- back and forth through e-mail and phone calls, so I couldn't recall if I had met her in person.

Q. How many interactions with law enforcement have you had in your life? How many times has an officer -- strike that.

How many interactions with law enforcement have you had in your life?

A. Possibly three.

Q. Okay. So fair to say that if -- that an interaction with Officer Hoffman on your doorstep in your house, on the sidewalk outside, that would've been significant for you?

A. I just can't remember. It was so long -- it was a couple of years ago.

Q. Okay. And fair to say that you didn't disclose anything to Officer Hoffman about any sexual abuse that you were allegedly suffering at John's hands?

A. At the time, I didn't know what to call it.

Q. Okay. And did a detective with the Leander Police Department ever follow up with you about these allegations?

A. I -- it was very difficult going back and forth over the phone. I got to -- so I don't remember, I'd

have to look at my e-mails.

Q. To your knowledge, was Jessica ever arrested?

A. No.

Q. Did the Williamson County prosecutor's office prosecute a case against her?

A. No.

Q. So the case went nowhere?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And because that case went nowhere, you filed a lawsuit in the Williamson County courthouse against Jessica?

A. Yes.

Q. A civil lawsuit?

A. Yes.

MR. PURYEAR: And Judge, may I approach?

THE COURT: You may.

Q. (By Mr. Puryear) While she's looking through those records, just from big picture, this lawsuit, again, dealt with Jessica, John's ex-wife, allegedly videotaping sexual interactions -- sexual encounters between you and John and that's -- that's, again, big picture kind of what it involved and her alleged distribution of those videos?

A. It was also defamation.

Q. Okay. Very good.

MR. PURYEAR: Judge, at this time, we'll offer Respondent's Exhibit 1.

MRS. LOCKE: I don't have any objections.

THE COURT: All right. Respondent's 1 is admitted.

MR. PURYEAR: I'm going to publish portions of this, Judge, to the Court electronically if that's all right?

THE COURT: Sure.

Q. (By Mr. Puryear) All right, [redacted]. So I want to ask you a few questions about that lawsuit. And in that lawsuit, you allege several different causes of actions including unlawful disclosure or promotion of intimate visual material, common law defamation, statutory libel, business disparagement, tortious interference with business relations, intrusion on seclusion and stalking. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And you filed this lawsuit on June 25th, 2024 in Williamson County?

A. Yes.

Q. And that, what we just published as Respondent's Exhibit 1, that's a certified copy of that lawsuit?

A. Okay.

Q. Is that fair?

A. Yes, I didn't see it. Yes.

Q. And you described your relationship with TECTONE as a private, romantic relationship on Page 6 of that lawsuit?

A. Where?

Q. I can make it a little bit easier for you, [redacted].

A. Oh, okay. Thank you.

Q. You got it. So this -- this lawsuit, and this is a -- the front page of that lawsuit. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. And on Page 6, you refer to the relationship -- and again, TECTONE is John. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. And Pinkchyu, that's you?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And so in your lawsuit, as kind of the background of the relationship between the parties, you described the relationship that you had with John as a private, romantic relationship?

A. Yes.

Q. And again, this was filed in June of 2024?

A. Yes.

Q. I want to also direct your attention to a second page in that. You, at various points in this lawsuit,

discuss or characterize sexual interaction between you and John. Is that fair?

A. The interactions from December of 2022.

Q. Correct. And you describe these, in various points, as private, intimate moments between Pinkchyu and TECTONE?

A. Yes.

Q. And a romantic relationship between TECTONE and Pinkchyu?

A. Yes.

Q. And you talk about some of the false statements that people have been making about you and John and the videos that have been allegedly distributed?

A. Yes.

Q. And some of the, I think you call them, rumors that are online?

A. I believe so, if that's what it says.

Q. Okay. And you said that there were some, quote, toxic lies being distributed and distributing the intimate videos involving you and John?

A. Yes.

Q. And how these videos, these intimate videos allegedly being distributed, have negatively impacted your career prospects. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. How you weren't getting signed to Mythic Talent as soon as you might have otherwise?

A. Yes.

Q. So fair to say from that experience, you have a good understanding of how an allegation or rumors online can affect somebody's career?

A. Yes.

Q. Because you experienced it --

A. Yes.

Q. -- when you went through this with Jessica. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. And you're extremely aware from that experience that an allegation like that can influence ability to get endorsements?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And business deals that may happen, it may affect how many followers you might have and any of your social media streams. Is that fair?

A. Not entirely.

Q. Okay. What was incorrect about that or what would you disagree with?

A. I would say similar to kind of how John has dealt with it, is you just go make a pivot to very hateful and opposite type of content to garner new audiences in that

sphere, and you can actually grow is what I've seen people do.

Q. And since you -- well, strike that.

Again, you characterize those interactions between you and John as recorded, intimate -- recorded, intimate interactions between Pinkchyu and TECTONE?

A. Correct, for December of 2022.

Q. And among those false statements that you identified were that TECTONE was grooming you. And then you go on to say that grooming is defined as the practice of preparing or training someone for a particular purpose or activity; in this connotation, Fream. Who is that?

A. His ex-wife.

Q. Jessica?

A. Yes.

Q. Was implying that TECTONE was preparing Pink as a sex slave because she was autistic. However, this is not the basis of the relationship between TECTONE and Pinkchyu. Is that correct?

A. That is what's written, yes.

Q. Okay. And again, this lawsuit was filed in June of 2024?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And both of the specific interactions that

you list in your application for protective order happened before that, is that fair, in March of 2024?

A. Some of them, some of them.

Q. But the ones that you list with specificity in your application for a protective order happened in March of 2024, and then in May 28th or May 29th of 2024?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. This lawsuit was filed less than a month after this last incident of sexual abuse allegedly perpetrated by John on you?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. But despite that, you are calling the allegation that John was grooming you as a lie. Is that fair?

A. I was not aware I was being sexually abused at the time.

Q. Okay. And can you explain that?

A. I did not, until I confided to a friend after, I knew I -- what was going on was not good and I didn't know what to call it.

Q. Okay.

A. And that did not happen until after I moved out and confided into someone.

Q. But you described for Mrs. Locke on direct that both of these incidents caused you pain?

A. Yes.

Q. And was without your consent?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. But it wasn't until you talked to a friend, after you and John broke up, that you changed your view on these things and decided that it was sexual abuse?

A. Not deciding. That is sexual abuse.

Q. Okay. But at the time you filed this lawsuit, you believed that the idea that John was grooming you or that you were his sex slave or that that was the basis of your relationship, you believed that to be a lie?

A. I was highly manipulated at the time.

Q. That was not my question.

A. Okay.

Q. My question was, at the time you filed this lawsuit, you believed the idea that John was grooming you or that you were his sex slave or that that was the basis of your relationship, you believed that was a lie?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay.

A. At the time, yes.

Q. And further, you called them disgusting lies,

these rumors that were spread about you and John?

A. Yes.

Q. And further, you believed the idea or the rumor that you were going to have gag reflex surgery, you believed that was a disgusting lie?

A. Yes.

Q. And in June of 2024, you believed that the idea that John was grooming you as a sex slave, that that was a disgusting lie?

A. At the time, yes.

Q. Okay. And again, this is less than a month after this May 28th or May 29th incident that you put down in your application for a protective order?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And in this lawsuit, despite, according to your testimony, having been abused by John, at least in March of 2024 and then in May, May 28th or May 29th of 2024, in this lawsuit, you didn't describe your relationship with John as one of an abuser and a victim?

A. At the time, I did not. I was not fully aware of what my situation was.

Q. My question is, in that lawsuit that you filed in June of 2024, did you describe the nature of your relationship with John as one of abuser and victim?

A. In the writing, yes, that's what I wrote, yes or

the lawyers wrote, put together.

Q. Where, in that lawsuit, do you describe your relationship with John as one of an abuser --

A. Sorry. I think I'm just confused on the question.

Q. Okay. In any place in that lawsuit, do you characterize your relationship with John as one of an abuser and a victim?

A. Me or --

Q. You don't?

A. No.

Q. Is that fair?

A. Okay. I don't.

Q. Right. Is it fair to say that at no place in that lawsuit do you describe your relationship with John as a sexually abusive one?

A. No.

Q. And is it fair to say that in this lawsuit you didn't describe, your relationship with John as a sexually coercive one?

A. Wait, sorry. Repeat that question.

Q. At no place in this lawsuit do you describe your relationship with John as a sexually coercive one?

A. No.

Q. And despite you filing this lawsuit on June 25th,

2024, less than a month after John allegedly sexually abused you?

A. Yes.

Q. And in cause of action Number 2, again, you describe this characterization of John grooming you to be a sex slave as false?

A. At the time.

Q. In June of 2024?

A. Yes.

Q. Less than a month after John last allegedly sexually abused you?

A. Yes.

Q. So in June of 2024, it was false that John was grooming you?

A. No, just what I had written at the time. I was not aware of what to call what I was going through.

Q. But that's what you put in your lawsuit, that it was false that John was grooming you. Is that correct?

A. Yes, that's --

Q. That's what was in your lawsuit?

A. Yes, that's what's written.

Q. And in your lawsuit of June of 2024, it was false that John was preparing or training you to be a sex slave, that's what's in your lawsuit. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And in that lawsuit that you filed in June of 2024, it was false that you were John's sex slave. That's what's in the lawsuit. Is that correct?

A. Yes, that's what's in the lawsuit.

Q. And on Page 13 of that lawsuit, again, filed on -- in June of 2024, less than a month after John, according to your testimony, brutally, orally assaults you, you call the notion of you being John's, quote, John's whore, end quote, a, quote, lie without any substantiation?

A. Yes.

Q. And again, this is less than a month after that May 28th/May 29th incident that you put in your application for a protective order?

A. Yes.

Q. Some time in the early summer, you and John end your relationship, whatever type of relationship it was, you end it?

A. Yes.

Q. And that was kind of an extended process. Is that fair?

A. How so?

Q. Well, you didn't break up in an afternoon. You move all your stuff out that afternoon and you never see each other again?

A. Okay, yes, it was extended.

Q. Yeah.

A. Correct.

Q. It was protracted, use whatever word you want, it took a while. Is that fair?

A. It took a while after -- it was fairly fast after I got out of the hospital.

Q. You mean Austin Oaks?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. But throughout that time, you guys were continuing to communicate?

A. Yes.

Q. And you and John continued to be intimate?

A. Yes.

Q. Consensually intimate?

A. What is the timeline of this?

Q. Well, let's say June and July of 2024.

A. I don't know. I'd have to look at the -- what was going on at the time.

Q. Okay. On July 23rd, do you recall discussing a sexual encounter you had with John and describing how hard it was to be, quote, friends with benefits? Do you remember that?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And what does friends with benefits mean

to you?

A. That was my first time ever having that, so I didn't -- that's just the term he used.

Q. Well, if I represent to you that that's in a text message between you and John, and that's a phrase that you used, what would that mean to you?

A. I guess friends whd are sexually active.

Q. Okay. And you and John were sexually active?

A. Yes.

Q. Consensually sexually active?

A. Prior to that, no.

Q. Prior to what?

A. Because there was -- I do remember there was one consensual action from the friends with benefits situation; but the other times, there were not. There were many times that were not consensual.

Q. At some point in June or July of 2024, did you engage in consensual -- in a consensual sexual encounter with John Robertson?

A. I believe one time.

Q. One time. And that's probably the time that you're maybe referring to in some of the text messages. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. All of the other times were nonconsensual?

A. No, there were specific times that were and there were many times that were not. It is very nuanced.

Q. Okay. But you guys were broken up at this point?

A. Yes, I broke up with him.

Q. Okay. So would -- I mean, how would these nonconsensual -- if you guys are broken up, how would these nonconsensual encounters come about?

A. No --

Q. Had you moved out at this point?

A. No, I'm speaking about the time that he wanted to be friends with benefits, there was one consensual time. And then that was it --

Q. Okay.

A. -- from what I can remember.

Q. And you remember going into Austin Oaks on June 29th?

A. If that's the date that's on file.

Q. Okay. And your phone number at the time was [redacted]?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall texting John the day before you went into Austin Oaks at 7:44 p.m., Sorry, last thing, as a thank you, can I sucky your dick tonight?

A. This is what he instructed me to do.

Q. But did you send that text message?

A. Yes.

Q. So just to be clear, so I understand your testimony, John instructed you to send him a text message asking that you could suck his dick that night?

A. Yes, he told me I needed to ask to suck his dick to show he could trust me because I tried to reach out to another girl and talk about what he had been doing.

MRS. LOCKE: What was the date of that?

MR. PURYEAR: June 28th, 2024.

MRS. LOCKE: That was the month before hospitalization.

MR. PURYEAR: That was the night before.

MRS. LOCKE: No, hospitalization was July.

MR. PURYEAR: I'm sorry, July 28th, 2024.

MRS. LOCKE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. PURYEAR: And Judge, may I approach?

THE COURT: You may.

MRS. LOCKE: What's the date on this?

MR. PURYEAR: That was July 23rd.

MRS. LOCKE: I don't know if she can authenticate it.

MR. PURYEAR: Judge, may I approach?

THE COURT: You may.

Q. (By Mr. Puryear) And [redacted], that is a fair and accurate representation of those conversations that you had with John, I believe, from July 28th, 2004 -- 2024 leading into July 29th?

A. Yes, I remember.

Q. Okay. And this is a fair and accurate copy. Is that correct?

A. Yes, I believe so. Yes.

MR. PURYEAR: And I'm now going to mark and offer this as Respondent's Exhibit 3 -- 2 and 3, Your Honor. I would offer them at this time.

MRS. LOCKE: No objections.

THE COURT: Respondent's 2 and 3 are admitted.

MR. PURYEAR: Permission to publish, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

Q. (By Mr. Puryear) Again, [redacted], at 7:44 p.m. on July 28th, 2024, you say, Love you. And then what do you call that? An emoji?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. What does that emoji signify?

A. HAppy, nervous.

Q. Okay. Hope you're having a good day. Sorry, last thing. As a thank you, can I sucky our -- I assume

you meant your -- dick tonight? And then another emoji. And what does that emoji signify?

A. A mouth opening.

Q. Okay. And this was the day before you went into Austin Oaks?

A. Yes.

Q. And when you went into Austin Oaks, they did a screening process with you. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. And they would've --

MR. PURYEAR: Judge, may I approach?

THE COURT: You may.

MRS. LOCKE: Are you going to introduce all of the records?

MR. PURYEAR: I am. That is excerpts. I have -- they're voluminous, so I have them on a flash drive.

MRS. LOCKE: Judge, I don't have an objection, but I think the entirety of the records need to come in, not just the sections. I don't know if they're coming in under the business records affidavit.

MR. PURYEAR: Judge, I have a copy of -- an electronic copy of the records.

THE COURT: Okay. So you're offering the electronic copy of the entirety of the records?

MR. PURYEAR: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. Is that Respondent's 4?

MR. PURYEAR: That is Respondent's 4. And I'll represent to the Court and opposing counsel that that's what they are.

THE COURT: Okay. And any objection to Respondent's 4 --

MRS. LOCKE: No.

THE COURT: -- in its entirety?

MRS. LOCKE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Respondent's 4 is admitted.

MR. PURYEAR: Judge, can we take a comfort break?

THE COURT: Sure. How much time?

MR. PURYEAR: Not much.

THE COURT: I think after this witness we'll take a lunch break, maybe not an entire hour.

(Brief recess.)

THE COURT: Please proceed.

MR. PURYEAR: Thank you, Your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (cont'd.)

BY MR. PURYEAR:

Q. [redacted], again I think when we broke we were discussing you going into Austin Oaks?

A. Yes.

Q. And before you went into Austin Oaks, you sent John a series of text messages and you guys had a text conversation about your decision to go into Austin Oaks. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And that's what we see on the screen behind us. Is that fair?

A. Yes, our discussion, yes.

Q. And you said, I really need a friend right now. I think I need to go to the mental hospital. My mom doesn't answer. I don't know if the medicine -- I'm having a hard time. I need to see a doctor. Figuring it out right now. Packing my bags, heading to my mom's. I hope you see this, but I'm going to do the right thing and get a full psych evaluation and get some real help. I love you so much. I'm sorry if I ever hurt you and I can't wait to come back feeling better. I love you.

Is that what you wrote?

A. Yes.

Q. And did John direct you to write any of that?

A. No, not that.

Q. Okay. Just the other part about the oral sex that evening?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. But that was the only part that he directed you to write?

A. No. He's done it before.

Q. Okay. And then he responds, Jesus Christ. All right. Well, be safe and trust your decision.

Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. He doesn't belittle you?

A. Not in that text.

Q. Correct. In that text, he doesn't belittle you?

A. No, not in that text.

Q. Okay. He doesn't call you crazy?

A. Not in that text.

Q. He doesn't call you psycho?

A. No.

Q. Okay. He says, If you need me, just text me. I have my phone now. I am so sorry you're going through this, Pink. Correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. He's supportive?

A. In those texts.

Q. Okay. Sure. And for sake of our questions about these text messages, that's what I'm referring to.

A. Okay.

Q. In this group of text messages, he's not

dismissive?

A. No.

Q. He doesn't use any pejorative language, crazy, psycho, anything like that. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And in fact, when you message him, hey, he says, first thing, Hey, are you safe?

A. Yes.

Q. That's what -- that's the priority for him, is making sure you're safe?

A. Okay.

Q. Is that correct?

A. If that's what he -- I don't -- I'm not him. I can't tell you.

Q. Okay.

A. But that's what it reads as.

Q. Right. But that's what he wrote. Is that correct?

A. Yes, that's what he wrote.

Q. Okay. And then you respond with, I'm safe, yes, trying to figure this out. And he doesn't say, Cool, don't care, good luck. He says, Okay. Keep me updated.

A. Yes.

Q. And then you describe your sister coming to take you, going to Dell Seton. And then you eventually say,

They're probably going to take my phone away. In other words, don't be surprised if I don't call or message. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. And you say -- John says, Everything will be okay. And you respond, I love you so much. Please don't tell anyone. And John replies, 100 percent. Are you with your sister? Yeah, she's on her way. Can I call again? If not, that's okay. And he says, I need you to be strong?

A. Yeah.

Q. Correct?

A. (Witness nods head.)

Q. Again, he's supportive, he's encouraging of you getting whatever acute mental health crisis you have going on addressed. Is that fair?

A. I wasn't having -- it was -- I just wasn't feeling good. It wasn't acute.

Q. Okay. Well, we'll get into that in some of those medical records. I mean, at the time, were you having some feelings, some thoughts of self harm?

A. I mean, yeah, I was --

Q. Okay.

A. -- in a bad situation.

Q. Sure. And -- okay. Maybe we have a different

definition of an acute mental health crisis, but you felt like you needed to go?

A. I just needed to get out of there.

Q. Okay. And then again, John says, Text me when you're on your way and please be safe. Be careful.

A. Uh-huh.

Q. Correct? And you eventually tell him, I'm going to Austin Oaks. And that's when you check yourself in?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. I want to ask you about that process. And when you go in to Austin Oaks, they ask you a bunch of screening questions. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

MR. PURYEAR: Judge, may I approach?

THE COURT: You may.

Q. (By Mr. Puryear) And they ask you a bunch of screening questions. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. They want to get to know your situation a little bit more?

A. Okay.

Q. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. For instance, they're going to ask you on Page 26 what you're allergic to and you respond [redacted]. Is that correct? Are you allergic to [redacted]?

A. On my hands, I get red bumps.

Q. Yeah, you get red bumps and you disclose that to the nurse at Austin Oaks, that you get red bumps if you touch [redacted]?

A. Yes.

Q. And they ask you about a special diet, if you have any -- a special diet going on. And on Page 31, you talk about [redacted] that you have at the time?

A. Yes.

Q. Yeah. Because you knew the importance, when you were going through the screening process, when they were asking you questions of being honest, accurate and complete in your answers. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. Because you knew if you left something very important out, it could lead to disastrous results, right? If you didn't tell them about your [redacted] allergy, for instance, and they touched you with a [redacted], you could get those red bumps?

A. Yeah.

Q. So understanding that, that's why it's so

important to be honest, to be complete, to be accurate in the answers you provided. Is that fair?

A. To the best of my knowledge.

Q. And for instance, they asked you about your history of your present illness on Page 15 and you indicated that you, quote, [redacted]?

A. When I'm in high stress situations.

Q. Okay. And then you go on to say that that was the reason that you believed John broke up with you?

A. No, I don't -- I don't -- oh, the first time, that wasn't -- I don't believe that was the reason the first time.

Q. Okay.

A. I broke up -- are you talking about the time where we, like, mutually talked and -- or are you talking about the time that I broke up with him?

Q. In the medical records, you describe it [redacted]. And that's why you believe John broke up with you, was because [redacted] --

A. Do you mind telling me what page that is on?

Q. Sure. That's on Page 15.

A. I don't see that. I just see, [redacted].

Q. And that's how you, in those medical records,

characterize your relationship with John, is that correct, that you were friends?

A. No. I'm just confused because you said [redacted] and that's the reason we broke up, but I can't find it on the pages.

Q. Okay. I can get that addressed for you.

A. Okay.

Q. So that last line on history of present illness, description of acute illness or expectation of illness requiring admission?

A. Do you -- is it on these printed pages? I just can't find them or is this a separate page?

Q. Yeah. So it's on that screen that you should be able to see.

A. Oh, it's just on the screen?

Q. Yep.

A. Okay. And these are things that they wrote down because I don't believe that's my handwriting.

Q. Well, yeah. They would've --

A. Okay.

Q. -- talked to you and would've reduced -- reduced what you had to tell them down to writing.

A. Okay. I'm just trying to understand. Sorry.

Q. Yep.

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And again, you detail that you get [redacted]. Do you get [redacted]?

A. I mean, anyone who is getting abused gets pretty [redacted].

Q. Okay.

A. I --

Q. Do you [redacted]?

A. I haven't in the past year since I've been out of this situation.

Q. Okay. But at the time, you were?

A. Not in front of anyone. It was more of like by myself.

Q. So if it was -- if it was by yourself, then why do you think that's -- why, at the time in July of 2024, did you believe that was the reason John broke up with you?

A. I believed they probably miswrote when I was explaining to them because I was probably crying and stuff.

Q. Oh, okay. Okay. But the quotation marks there, you think that they maybe mischaracterized what you told them?

A. I think they may have, like --

Q. Okay.

A. It looks like they were trying to cut it down into pieces and I think they probably weren't understanding what I was trying to explain.

Q. Okay. Fair enough. We'll come back to that.

But you think the nurse, though you were attempting to be accurate, honest and complete in your answers, you think the nurse, with training and certification, probably wrote it down wrong?

A. Well, no. It's because I was under like a lot of distress. I was just trying to explain everything as much as I could and putting that into one small paragraph.

Q. Got you.

A. It's very hard to do that accurately.

Q. Got you, okay. And then in -- on Page 33, they ask you about your history of sexual victimization.

A. Okay.

Q. And your -- and they ask you about your history of sexual victimization in the last six months. Do you remember that?

A. Yes.

Q. And your answer at the time was [redacted]. Is that correct?

A. Yes, because at the time I didn't know that I

was.

Q. Okay. And so when they asked you that question -- and again, this covers in the last six months. This is in -- this is July 29th of 2024. Correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And so going six months back, that would've covered both the May 28th/May 29th incident that you allege of 2004 (*sic*) that you allege in your application for protective order?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that correct? That occurred within six months of you going into Austin Oaks?

A. Yes, and I was not aware that was --

Q. Hold --

A. Okay.

Q. But it covers that. Is that correct?

A. Yes, yes.

Q. And it also covers that March of 2024 incident that you discuss in your application for a protective order. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. So they ask you specifically, have you been sexually victimized in any way, not sexually assaulted, but sexually victimized in any way, and your answer on

July 29th, 2024 was [redacted]. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And they go on to ask your entire history of sexual victimization; again, not just sexual assault, not a criminal offense, but any sexual victimization at all over your lifetime, and you say [redacted]. But you clarify and explain that [redacted]. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. You would agree with me that at no point in this question do you mention any intimate interaction that you had with John, that you don't discuss anything related to John at all. Is that correct?

A. No, I did not.

Q. Okay. And you understood at the time that you needed to be honest, complete and accurate in the information and answers that you were providing?

A. To the best of my current knowledge.

Q. Okay. They also ask you on Page 16 of those, Have you experienced any emotional, physical or sexual abuse history in any way? And you disclose that [redacted]?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And was that the relationship that you

were in six years prior to going into Austin Oaks?

A. I was a child.

Q. Okay. Do you discuss your relationship sexual abuse in this answer?

A. You mean with John? Wait. I'm sorry. I'm confused.

Q. I mean any adult sexual victimization, do you discuss that in this answer?

A. No, I don't believe I did.

Q. Okay. Did you mention any sexual abuse in this answer at John's hands?

A. I believe I only put it [redacted] in there.

Q. Okay. At any point, in any of these records, do you discuss, according to your testimony, this vicious -- these multiple, vicious, brutal sexual -- coerced sexual encounters that you had with John?

A. No.

Q. Okay. And again, this was just two months after the last alleged brutal, oral, sexual victimization that you had experienced?

A. And before I had confided and got clarification of what was going on.

Q. Okay. But you had been through sexual abuse before. Is that fair? You were familiar, unfortunately, with what that looks like, with what that

feels like, the dynamics involved?

A. It was very different. It was full blown, you know, crying, pulling your pants down, raping you. And like that is very different. I understood, like, what rape is. I didn't fully understand, like, sexual assault.

Q. Okay. I want to pivot and I want to ask you about how you -- so you're released from Austin Oaks. Is that correct?

A. May I have a moment? I'm sorry. Okay. My apologies.

Q. You're released from Austin Oaks and you and John continue communicating? In fact, I believe he is listed [redacted]?

A. Yes.

Q. Yes. You listed him as that?

A. Yes, because that's where I was living at the time.

Q. Okay. And you send John your patient access code so that he can call up to Austin Oaks, so that he can find out more information. Is that fair?

A. I don't remember if I did that.

Q. Okay. If that's in those text messages, would you have any reason to disagree with that?

A. No.

Q. Okay. I want to fast forward to a post that believe you made on X. I think we can get rid of formerly known as Twitter by this point in time.

MRS. LOCKE: Well, what fun is that?

Q. (By Mr. Puryear) And this was on November 20th, 2024. You write on your Twitter, How are you supposed to feel if a guy's abusive and makes you cry, then shoves your head on his crotch and demands that you suck him off and his excuse is, quote, emotion just turns me on when you cry? Or when you asking that you don't feel comfortable doing something sexual and he records you and demands you stop making faces and pretend you like it? Or you say you don't want to do it anymore and he shoves your head down until you throw up, guilt trips you into giving BJs and says, Do your job, you don't pay rent. I took you to a water park so you owe me. And all you can do is sleep upstairs because you know what he's going to keep telling you to do?

Do you remember making that post?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And this wasn't a private post. Correct?

A. It was on an alternative account with a very low following. It was really just for close friends and small fans, not like my main account.

Q. Well, it says Pink and that's kind of your screen

name. Is that fair?

A. It's like an alternative name. Pinkchow or something like that.

Q. Okay. But fair to say, in November of -- November 20th of 2004, well before any of the exhibits that were entered into evidence, well before any of that, you make the allegation that John had sexually abused you. Is that fair?

MRS. LOCKE: Judge, I'm going to object. One, that's a mischaracterization; and additionally, the best evidence are actually the text messages. We don't even have them to know what they say.

THE COURT: Any response?

MR. PURYEAR: Judge, I think she's ratified through testimony that those were her Twitter posts. I think that is in evidence.

THE COURT: All right. Objection overruled.

Q. (By Mr. Puryear) So [redacted], I'm going to ask you again, November -- November 20th of 2024, well before any of those exhibits were posted that are in evidence now, through your direct testimony, well before that, you discuss John allegedly abusing you?

A. I did not say any names. I talked about a personal experience I had.

Q. Okay. And very similarly, again, I think we've

established that none of the posts that have been entered into evidence that John made mention your name in any way. Is that fair?

A. There are posts though that he does mention my name.

Q. Okay. But you would agree with me that the allegations in your November 20th, 2024 Twitter post, they mirror the allegations that you made in your application for a protective order?

A. It's a place where I can write down my personal feelings like a journal without -- you know, it's just personal thoughts.

Q. Okay. Much in the way John communicates online?

A. But he uses my name.

Q. I'm --

A. Sorry. I'm just saying like there were -- there are posts where he uses my name.

Q. Okay. At the risk of getting an asked and answered objection, I'm going to ask you again.

A. Sorry, my apologies.

Q. Can you point me to any exhibit that is in evidence where John posts [redacted], [redacted], Pink, Pinkchyu or [redacted]?

A. Is that binder -- does that count as the --

Q. No, ma'am.

A. Okay.

Q. The exhibits that are in evidence.

A. Okay. Not the ones that were shown.

Q. Correct. So fair to say that while you don't mention John's name in this Twitter post on November 20th, 2024, fair to say he doesn't mention your name in any of the exhibits that are in evidence?

A. Just in the exhibits. Just in the exhibits.

Q. Okay. Was your relationship high profile?

A. I'd say at the time, we weren't very public and then we became public. So I guess -- what's high profile I guess? Because like I think high profile, think of politicians or celebrities.

Q. Okay. Well, within kind of the relative scope of your sphere of influence online, did most of your followers know that you were in a relationship with TECTONE?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Did most of John's -- from what you observed, did most of John's followers know that he was in a relationship with you for quite a while?

A. Yes.

Q. In fact, it is exactly that relationship and the impact that online rumors had on your business that served as the basis of the lawsuit that you filed in

Williamson County. Is that correct?

A. No, it's not -- it's not exactly the same because she did those behind closed doors.

Q. Okay. But my question to you is, if you didn't have a significant online presence, there would've been no significant online presence for Jessica to damage?

A. Yes.

Q. Would you agree with me?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So you would agree with me that you had at least a significant online presence enough that rumors online, lies according to you, disgusting lies that were spread online, could damage your image to the point that you would lose endorsements, business deals, things like that?

A. It's possible.

Q. What -- and, in fact, again, that's what you alleged in that lawsuit. Fair?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So you knew the impact with even, to borrow kind of a phrase from your testimony, your small in comparison to John's following, the impact that lies or rumors or negative comments could have on a business. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. Because again, that's the entire basis of that lawsuit that you filed?

A. Okay.

Q. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And understanding that in your sphere of influence online, it was well known that you were in a relationship with John. And understanding that in John's sphere of influence, it was well known that he was in a relationship with you online, you would agree with me that it's reasonable that those people, upon reading that Twitter post, would come to the assumption that you're talking about him. Is that fair?

A. Not at first, until he publicly stated it himself and he said that it was about him.

Q. Okay. You don't think it's reasonable at all that anybody would read that, understanding that you guys had been in a relationship, and come to the conclusion that you were talking about him?

A. Maybe some people, but not -- because there was no clarification who I was talking about or any names.

Q. Okay. What was your intention in posting that?

A. It was really for my friends, I think.

Q. Okay.

A. People that he had been trying to isolate me.

Q. Okay. But you would agree with me that you were free to text message those friends, you were free to direct message those friends?

A. No.

Q. You couldn't do that?

A. I was -- I believe I was ignored and blocked by many people after we broke up.

Q. Okay. So it sounds like your intention was more not to communicate with close friends, but was to try and influence people that --

A. And -- sorry.

Q. No, go ahead and answer.

A. It was also just the right thing to do, I think.

Q. Okay. To publicly come out with what had happened?

A. Yeah.

Q. Okay. So it sounds like, upon a little reflection, that maybe part of your motivation at least was to publicly discuss what you allegedly experienced?

A. In my own personal experience. I didn't say anyone's name though.

Q. Okay. But we can agree that part of your motivation in doing that was to let other people know?

A. I don't -- I don't understand. Like --

Q. Okay. Well, you have a journal. Is that fair?

A. That was just a thing to write on. I don't really keep a journal.

Q. Okay. And for whose use is that?

A. That was just for him to write down the things he thought were wrong with me.

Q. Okay. And you could memorialize any personal thoughts that you have in that journal. Is that fair?

A. No, there's really not any personal thoughts. There's only two pages that were written or three.

Q. Let's take a step back.

Twitter is a -- is social media?

A. Yes.

Q. Correct?

A. Yes.

Q. The purpose of Twitter is to communicate with other people?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. The purpose of Twitter is to communicate, unless you have a private setting, with anyone that looks at your profile. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. And if you wanted to communicate with friends, you could've used text message, e-mail, direct message?

A. It's more complicated, I think.

Q. How?

A. Like, if somebody's blocked you or ignoring or doesn't want to get involved or scared to reach out and a lot of awkward interactions.

Q. So it's your sworn testimony here today in court that zero part of your motivation in posting that to Twitter was to let the general public know what you'd experienced with John?

A. It had to do with a personal experience I experienced and I didn't explicitly say names.

Q. Were you talking about John?

A. He assumed I was talking about him.

Q. I didn't ask that.

I said, Were you talking about John? And I'll remind you, you are under oath. Okay?

A. (Witness nods head.)

Q. Okay. Here we go. So you were talking about John. And when you put it on social media, we can agree that it's reasonable that people in the public, specifically business associates of John's, specifically potential employers of John's, would see it. Is that reasonable? Is that possible?

A. I didn't think it was possible until he went public the next day. Like I said, it was all --

Q. Is your Twitter set to private?

A. No, but I put it on a small Twitter page that not

many people could find. And that was like an alternative page with not many followers.

Q. Okay. If I represent to you -- if I represent to you that 114,000 people saw that tweet, that that's what's reflected on your Twitter?

A. Was that before or after he publicly made it public or publicized it?

Q. I'm just asking you a question. Would that surprise you?

MRS. LOCKE: Judge, I'm going to object. The timing of the views in comparison to when it was posted and the number of followers she had on that post. mean, he keeps talking about he never names her. We're getting ready to show the video where he specifically names Pink the day after these messages so...

THE COURT: I mean, I agree. Asking how many views there have been of this video now today is completely distorted. So I mean, you can ask a different question. How many followers, how many views at that time, if she knows, but to ask -- to reference it today is not what you're asking her.

MR. PURYEAR: I agree with you, Your Honor.

Q. (By Mr. Puryear) Pink, let me ask this a different way. You had more than one follower. Is that

fair? Can we agree?

A. On that account, yes.

Q. Okay. So understanding that you were releasing information about your situation with John to at least one person, can we agree that you discussed this online prior to John discussing it online? Can we agree on that?

A. I did not, at the time, say anyone's name. And it wasn't explicitly about anyone at the -- like, I didn't have the purpose of it being for people to know exactly who. It was really for close friends and people in the space, if that makes sense.

Q. It doesn't. But do you want to keep explaining?

MRS. LOCKE: I'm going to object as to vague for the question.

THE COURT: I don't know if it's vague. It's definitely argumentative and so objection sustained.

MR. PURYEAR: I'll move on, Your Honor.

Q. (By Mr. Puryear) [redacted], again, we can agree you were talking about John when you made that post?

A. I had -- it was some of what he had done.

Q. Okay.

A. Somewhat, yes. Like, it was like --

Q. And you just testified that it was. So you --

A. Yeah, I'm saying, like, it's not everything is what I'm explaining.

Q. Okay. But that post was about John?

A. Yes, but not publicly stating anyone's name and not many people knew exactly who it was about at the time.

Q. Okay.

A. From what I'm aware of.

Q. Okay, very good.

MR. PURYEAR: I will pass the witness, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mrs. Locke?

MRS. LOCKE: Yes, Judge, we are going to play what's been marked as Applicant's 47. It is a -- one of the streams from November 22nd of 2024. So it will be the day following the tweet that was just being discussed. And so I move to introduce that subject to what we discussed before.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. PURYEAR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Applicant's 47 is admitted.

(Video played.)

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MRS. LOCKE:

Q. Did you notice the comments that were going up on

the side? Did you have a chance to look at any of those? And if you didn't, that's okay.

A. Yeah, I didn't read them all.

Q. Prior to this video, had you made the allegations against Mr. Robertson public?

A. I had made a tweet without explicitly saying anyone's name.

Q. Okay. Let's actually -- let me pull up that tweet because I think it's already in evidence. You made -- they made reference to the medical records from Austin Oaks. You did not write down or fill out that paperwork. Right?

A. No.

Q. Okay. And they -- the nurses filled it out for you?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. And in there, do you also make reference to [redacted] as causing you stress?

A. I'm not entirely sure. If it says it in there --

Q. Okay. Let's go over the records. And so the Court is clear, you sued Mr. Robertson's ex-wife? You sued Mr. Robertson's ex-wife. Right?

A. Yes.

Q. And you sued her based on statements that she was

allegedly making. Correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And those were the statements that opposing counsel highlighted?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And what were the statements that she was accused of making?

A. That -- do I go into detail?

Q. What was -- because in your lawsuit that --

A. Oh, more than just that section?

Q. Yes.

A. Okay. Just that section, she was accusing him of grooming me as a slave.

Q. Okay. It was his ex-wife that was making those allegations in a public forum. Right?

A. She was telling that privately to people.

Q. Okay. And so you sued, I guess, to stop that?

A. I sued her so she wouldn't show any more videos or like to make sure that she wasn't -- didn't have access to the footage that she had recorded of me.

Q. Okay. And so -- but it wasn't you making those statements about Mr. Robertson. It was his ex-wife making --

A. Yes, yes.

Q. Let me finish my question.

A. Oh, sorry, sorry.

Q. It's all right.

And that was actually a settlement. Correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And you received payment from his ex-wife. Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. And there was some usual injunctions that you-all can't talk about each other publicly. Right?

A. Yes.

Q. And Mr. Robertson has made reference to an NDA, right, on multiple platforms, right?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. And without going into the details, that NDA relates to a lawsuit between he and his ex-wife post divorce. Right?

A. I believe it was an agreement that they made.

Q. Okay. It was an agreement?

A. Yes.

Q. And there was some NDA signed related to them not being allowed --

MR. PURYEAR: Judge, I'm going to object to speculation.

MRS. LOCKE: I can ask her, I can rephrase.

THE COURT: If she doesn't know, she doesn't know. She can ask the question.

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) Did Mr. Robertson tell you about this lawsuit?

A. He told me that he had sent her a cease and desist, paid her 30,000 dollars and had her sign an NDA not to go public.

Q. And this was right before you filed your lawsuit against her. Is that right?

A. I believe after he had her sign the NDA and paid her, I then -- we had our spat and I sued her.

Q. Okay. And was that at his encouragement, to sue her?

A. He encouraged a lot for me to sign an NDA and keep all of it under wraps due to the allegations the ex-wife had. He didn't want those going public.

Q. Okay. Did you also lose a dog during this time before you went to the Austin Oaks?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay.

A. My family dog.

Q. But it wasn't just your break up, you had other issues with regards to why you went to Austin Oaks?

A. Yes.

Q. Does going to Austin Oaks make any of your

allegations or accusations against Mr. Robertson untrue?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Is there some reason why you didn't give detailed information in the Austin Oaks records about what was going on with Mr. Robertson?

A. I just wanted to get an evaluation and leave. That's why I was only there for three days.

Q. And you, in fact, did not return to live back at Mr. Robertson's place. Is that correct?

A. No.

Q. All right. And then -- and these are the tweets that Mr. -- I'm sorry, that opposing counsel was talking about. Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. Can you point out where in this you provide Mr. Robertson's name?

A. Nowhere.

Q. Okay. Can you give a timeframe of when this occurred?

A. No.

Q. And did he make reference to this specific tweet in his rantings online?

A. Yes, all the time. Or a lot of the time, I'm sorry.

Q. And did he refer his followers to this tweet?

A. Yes.

Q. You heard in that video back on November 21st, 2024 -- or I'm sorry, November 22nd, 2024, that he said, It's war now?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall that?

A. (Witness nods head.)

Q. And what has he done to your life since he made that statement on November 22nd, 2024?

A. He completely destroyed my streaming career. I barely ever stream. I had to completely switch to another platform to -- for content and to make money.

Q. How did he destroy your streaming career?

A. No one wanted to get near me because he would attack them too. And he had already done that to some people. An example is -- her name's Morgan. People didn't want to associate with me or collab with me, so I actually ended up having to fly out to LA a lot to make friends and do collaborations to help my career.

Q. There was reference to a text message that you sent him asking him for a blow job right before your Austin Oaks stay. Do you recall that?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. Can you explain to the Court how that text came to be?

A. Are you talking about --

Q. The blowing.

A. Yes. So I had tried to originally confide in a girl that was a mutual friend.

Q. Okay. And when was that? When did you try to confide in her?

A. I believe it was possibly a week before that text or I don't remember.

Q. Okay.

A. It was a little bit after the first time we broke up.

Q. Okay. Then what happened?

A. I told her that he would make me give him bloW jobs and she freaked out. And I'm like, But it's all fine, it's not a big deal. And I got scared because I didn't know if I could trust her. He then, the next day, sat me in his office and sat me in a chair.

And he's like, I'm going to get on the phone, I'm going to step inside and out. And he stepped outside of the office and he said, You're going to tell me everything you told her in detail and I want to know if you're lying. And we're going to have her on the phone back and forth and find out all the information. You're going to text me that you want to suck my dick or else I'm going to not trust you.

Q. How tall is Mr. Robertson?

A. Six feet, six or seven.

Q. How tall are you?

A. 5'3".

Q. How much, to the best of your knowledge, does Mr. Robertson weigh?

A. I believe like 260, somewhere around there.

Q. And what is it -- I know no one wants to talk about weight. What is it you weigh?

A. 130.

Q. Okay. And when he had you in that chair in the office, what was his demeanor towards you?

A. Very angry.

Q. Did it cause you any concerns?

A. I was just terrified that she was going to say too much and he might do something. I don't know. I was just kind of scared.

Q. Okay. And then how long after that before you confided in someone else about the events that occurred during your relationship?

A. Him and this other girl went to Anime convention. asked my new assistant, she was a friend, a mutual friend of ours, to go with me to The Domain, that I just needed somebody to talk to. I confided in her some of the things he had, you know, done. And then I told her

that we never had sex, that he would only make me give him blow jobs. And she was just really worried. And me and her have become best friends since then. She's helped me through a lot.

Q. And I know you had some sexual assault in your past and you said you knew that was sexual assault. And I know the last thing you want to do is go into it, but can you just tell the Court briefly what happened with that so the Court understands what the distinction was in your head?

A. He had gone to the hospital for an injury. He told me -- asked me if I could help him into the bathroom. We went to the bathroom, he then pulled down my pants and raped me as I cried and told him no.

Q. And that was your boyfriend at the time when you were about in your early 20s?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And that was what you determined was a rape?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And you actually followed up with proper authorities and everything for that. Right?

A. Absolutely.

Q. And was that different than what Mr. Robertson was doing?

A. Yes. He tried to murder suicide us out of guilt on a highway at one point. It was very intense.

Q. That was not Mr. Robertson that was --

A. No, no, not Mr. Robertson. That was the other person.

Q. So that was an extreme event -- extreme events for you?

A. Yes, and those are all in the police record because he was 5150'd for that.

Q. But that is different than the actions that Mr. Robertson took with you?

A. Yes, that was rape.

Q. And your position is that -- I'm sorry. Let me rephrase that.

Mr. Robertson had you engage in behaviors against your -- sexual behaviors against your will. Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And it occurred on multiple occasions?

A. Yes.

Q. And you still believe that a protective order is necessary for your safety and protection?

A. Yes.

Q. And you're asking the Court to grant it today?

A. Yes, please.

MRS. LOCKE: I pass the witness.

THE COURT: Mr. Puryear?

MR. PURYEAR: Nothing at this time, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you for your testimony. You can join your attorney at the table.

Let's go ahead and take a long overdue break.

(Brief recess.)

THE COURT: Let's go back on the record in this cause. And Mrs. Locke, you can call your next witness.

MRS. LOCKE: Judge, I would reserve myself for attorney's fees at the very end. I have -- I'd like to introduce Applicant's Exhibit 43, which are the records from Trussler, MD, which is what I previously sent a copy of to opposing counsel.

THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Puryear?

MR. PURYEAR: No objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Applicant's 43 is admitted.

MRS. LOCKE: I'll approach the court reporter with the exhibit.

THE COURT: Okay. Other than the testimony regarding attorney's fees, do you rest at this time?

MRS. LOCKE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Puryear, please call your first witness.

MR. PURYEAR: Respondent calls John Robertson.

THE COURT: Mr. Robertson, if you'll please have a seat on the witness stand and make yourself comfortable?

(Witness sworn in.)

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. PURYEAR: Thank you, Your Honor.

JOHN ROBERTSON,

Having first been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. PURYEAR:

Q. All right, John, if you could please introduce yourself for purposes of the record?

A. My name is John Robertson. I'm 32 years old. I make YouTube videos.

Q. And John, do you, online, in your kind of various social media streams, do you have a screen name?

A. Yes, my screen name is TECTONE.

Q. Is TECTONE, okay. Tell me, where were you born?

A. I was born in Fort Sill, Oklahoma on a military base.

Q. Okay.

A. And then I moved shortly to Woodstock, Virginia shortly after.

Q. And I want to ask you a question, and this may be difficult, but I realize that it will be.

There was a reference made earlier in this hearing about some sexual abuse that you experienced as a child?

A. Yeah, when I was in third grade.

Q. When you were what?

A. Around third grade.

Q. Okay. And if you can -- if you can pull that microphone just a little bit closer to you?

A. Yeah, sorry.

Q. Yeah, perfect. So third grade?

A. Yeah.

Q. Tell me about that.

A. It was with a female family member. My female family member was led to believe that she had a thing called crabs. And, you know, my mother was very upset at her for being sexually mischievous. So one day when she was supposed to be taking care of me, she pulled my -- pulled my pants down and mounted me and grinded on me to maybe transfer it. And then she was called off later by another family member and that's pretty much

the extent of it.

Q. And you've been very open about that. You've talked about that on streaming and various social media posts. Is that correct?

A. Yes, I believe it's very important to be transparent with your audience via the hardship you've been through in order to grow from it and for other people who have gone through the same thing.

Q. Okay. Tell me about that. So how do you -- I think probably what is obvious to anyone that sat through this hearing, a lot of people in this room have no idea what you do for a living

A. Yeah.

Q. -- how the whole thing works. How did you get started in streaming?

A. Sure.

Q. Social media, can you walk us through that?

A. So I went up to Canada to date a girl I met off a video game called League of Legends. And I've been a pretty lazy guy in my life, I'm not going to lie. So finding any way to get a job where I didn't have to work too hard was pretty important to me because I am lazy. I'm not going to lie.

I had a buddy called Shane. I used play this game called Summers War, it's a Chinese got you game.

You collect various dragons and monster --

Q. What's a got you game?

A. Got you game is like -- well, it's kind of like, you know, you gamble and then the company's like, Got you. Like, they know you're addicted to the game. So I got very addicted to these type of games very early on.

And so in order to recoup some of the money that I spent on these gambling games, my buddy, Shane, was like, Hey, man, if you were to stream this, I'd watch you every day. And I said, Okay. And that worked out great because I needed a way to support me and my wife at the time where we both didn't really have that much money.

Q. What does that mean, really didn't have a whole lot of money?

A. Well, I was collecting funds via the GI bill that I inherited from my father. And that money was coming soon to an end for my final, like, semester for college and I realized that my money is over. And I'm a guy where no matter what, I like to be the provider in my relationship because that's how my -- you know, that's how I always saw relationships, was that the man has to provide and to take care of your wife no matter what.

So I wanted to make my wife's life as easy as possible. And I was like, I'm going to make it, Babe.

I'm going to do anything I can. And so I bet on myself and she bet on me. And then lo and behold six, seven, eight, years later, I made it.

Q. Did it start small?

A. No, it was actually very quick, very fast.

Q. Okay.

A. There was never really a period where I didn't have viewers. Something about me, people gravitated towards. I don't really know what that was, but I blew up pretty quick. Yeah, I started first stream, 7 viewers. Next stream, maybe like 10. Next stream like, 70, then 80. And then, you know, got bigger and bigger after that.

Q. It took off from there?

A. Yep.

Q. So how -- we've heard a couple of different organizations throughout this hearing. OTK?

A. Yep.

Q. And Mythic Talent, what are those?

A. So OTK is an organization that I was invited to by the members Asmongold, Tips Out and I think it was at the time -- oh, Rich Campbell. And Asmongold was a streamer that I watched when I had, like, nothing. So he was like one of my idols. And so when he invited me to join the organization, I was like, Oh my God. Like,

we made it, which is awesome.

So they kind of just make content to entertain the masses. Lots of IRL, lots of game shows kind of like Jeopardy or like we had this one called Loot Goblins, where it's kind of like Monopoly. And then Mythic Talent was an organization that I created with some peers from another company called AFK where they were actually, you know, not being too kind to their employees.

And so I took some of their employees and made our own ad company to bring money to creators because it's very difficult to become financially stable as a content creator. In a world that's ever changing, you can lose everything in an instant.

Q. Sure.

A. So being able to provide stability was important to me. So Mythic Talent set out to do that.

Q. Sure, okay. Let's -- and I think we can take it as a given, was this your primary source of income at this point?

A. My only source of income, yes.

Q. Okay. Going into December of 2022, this was your only source of income?

A. Everything.

Q. This was your job?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And is that when you met Pink?

A. I met Pink via a Twitter message that she sent me through one of our mutual friends. She was more close with Jay than I was, but I knew of Jay and he was a nice guy. He was always a little weird, but he was an honest guy. He was an earnest guy and I liked him, but I never really spent too much time with him.

But Jay recommended that I talk to her. Jay recommended Pink, that she talked to me. And she shot me the message, she referenced -- I believe she referenced Jay in the message. And I was like, Okay. So this is the girl that Pink (sic) was talking about. Apparently, I had met Pink before at a party and she tried to say hi to me, but I don't remember this.

Q. Okay.

A. But she did send me a message via Twitter after that. I'm not a big party guy, so I was just going through the motions. But yeah, we started talking in DMs. And very quickly, I found out that she likes two of my favorite things, which are Anime and video games.

Q. You-all hit it off?

A. Yeah, I'm a pretty simple guy. If you like Anime, you like video games, I like you. And so she expressed interest in that. This is also me coming off

the heels of my divorce.

Q. Sure.

A. And I thought, Wow, a very attractive woman is talking to me and she likes Anime and video games and she's really nice. Let's hang out. She was already going to go on a date with another streamer called Cory, which she invited me to this date because she didn't know the date was a date.

And then once Cory heard that me and my buddy, Laro were going, the guy said, No, I'm good, dipped. And then me and Laro went to go see the *Avatar: Way of the Water* movie, which was horrible. But we sat there for four hours and then we came back home and we played Settlers of Catan.

Q. You and Pink?

A. Me, Pink and Laro, yes.

Q. Okay.

A. If I can add further?

When Pink came to my house, it was the most forward a woman has ever been with me in my entire life. I've never experienced a woman be so blunt with like -- so for example, the topic of sex was brought up pretty quick. I had expressed that I'm not really into sex that much.

I don't think I went into detail on why that was

that night. And she asked me what I was into and I just said, I like long tongues. And then she puts her tongue out, points to her mouth and she says, Like this? And it was the most forward thing I've ever experienced in my entire life. I didn't really know what to do, but I was like, Wow, this is a very straightforward woman, which I was kind of expecting because I knew she had a --

Q. So you found that attractive?

A. Oh, absolutely.

Q. Okay. And what month? What year was this?

A. This was, to the best of my knowledge, late December, early January.

Q. Okay.

A. So --

Q. At some point, does she move in?

A. Yes, she moved in very quickly. Pink and I's relationship accelerated at a breakneck speed. She even invited me over to Christmas dinner with her family, like maybe, like, four or five days after we started speaking. And me and my buddy, Laro went to her family's house. And it was a beautiful Christmas. Her family is actually very kind. I didn't really have that much of a functioning family, so being invited --

Q. When did she move in?

A. Oh, really quick. She would frequently complain about her house. And I had already flown in my other buddy, Laro to stay with me for free because he was struggling. And, you know, I don't like being alone. So I let him move in with me for free.

And then Pink said that her house kind of sucked and she didn't really have anything to do about it because she couldn't just move out because she couldn't afford it. And I said, Hey, anything you need to make your life better, I'll do it. If you need money, I got you. Because there was this funny time she was in her house and she was very afraid because there was cockroaches. And so I -- I came to my car.

And I speed. I'm not going to lie. I -- you know, I've sped pretty bad. I went like 80 in like a 65 and I got pulled over that night. And I told the officer, you know, what -- the guy says, Why are you speeding? And I say, Well, officer it was for a girl. This girl that I like, you know, she's got cockroaches. And he says, No problem, I get it, let's me off. Gives me like a warning and then I go over there and I pick her up. And I bring her back to the house and then I say, Why don't you just move in?

Q. Let me ask you a question.

There's been talk about -- that there was a quid

pro quo that the expectation was that if Pink lived in your house rent free that she had to provide blow jobs to you. Is that true?

A. Not even in the slightest.

Q. Okay. Did you have a male roommate that you were living with?

A. Yes, Adam Laro.

Q. Okay. Did he pay rent?

A. Never once.

Q. Okay. Sounds like a silly question, was he expected to provide you blow jobs in exchange for living in your house?

A. No, he was not.

Q. Okay. You and Pink were in a romantic relationship. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Was it intimate?

A. I actually really enjoyed it. She was very kind, she was very quirky. And obviously, she had some issues, but I'm okay with that. I love helping people through their problems, so I was more than willing to help Pink with whatever she needed.

Q. Okay. Was it sexual?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay.

A. It was -- it was the most sexual relationship I've had.

Q. Okay. As this relationship progressed, was she also in streaming?

A. Yes.

Q. Was she in -- and I realize there's lots of kind of different worlds on the Internet and she had her own space. Were you invested in helping her grow her online brand?

A. Absolutely.

Q. Okay.

A. Like her, with every one of my other colleagues, if people want to find success in this world, I like helping them do that. And Pink is actually very funny. She was very good on her streams. And, you know, she was struggling a little bit because it's hard to make it as a streamer. She started off with GTA RP that she referenced earlier. Very funny clips, did some great songs too. And, you know, she was struggling for money. And I said, Hey, if you ever want advice, I'm always here.

Q. Okay. Did you leverage relationships that you had in that industry on her behalf?

A. Can you give me context? And what do you mean, did I leverage relationships?

Q. Did you -- by this point in time, you had been in the online industry for -- streaming industry, you have connections within the industry. Is that -- is that accurate?

A. Absolutely.

Q. Okay. Did you contact people that you knew in the industry to attempt to amplify her viewership --

A. Of course.

Q. Okay.

A. Yeah, I tried to make her have friends. She didn't really have too many friends, so I tried to help her make friends. I invited, you know, some people who I thought she'd get along with to the house and I introduced her to everybody I knew.

Q. Okay. Was there ever an expectation that because of this assistance that you provided, that there was a quid pro quo?

A. No.

Q. That she was expected to return this with sexual favors?

A. No, sir.

Q. Okay. Was -- did you ever threaten Pink with -- or [redacted] that if the relationship ended, that you would destroy her in the industry?

A. No, sir. As a matter of fact, when we split up,

there was an idea that maybe we continue living together, just as friends. But my friends advised me against it. But no, I would've never done that.

Q. Okay. At some point, were you made aware by [redacted], your ex-wife, that there was some -- did she ask you, Is she better than me or words to that effect?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Okay. And when was that?

A. To the best of my knowledge, I want to say it was some time maybe two to three months after Pink and I started dating. So maybe March of -- whether that be 2023 or -- yeah, probably March 2023, probably somewhere around that time.

Q. Okay.

A. That was a very uncomfortable period of time.

Q. Okay. Was that information related to Pink? Did you tell Pink about this conversation that you'd had with your wife?

A. Well, I tried to not let Pink know for maybe a week or two beforehand because Pink is very sensitive. And so I tried to deal with the issue beforehand, before she had to hear about it because if there's a problem, I'm going to attempt to solve it. And looking back on it, I probably should've told her earlier the moment I knew, but I thought I could've dealt with it myself.

And so I didn't tell her immediately, but I did tell her. And to my expectancy, Pink did not receive it well. And I don't blame her for it as well. It's very scary.

Q. Yeah, that's a reasonable reaction. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. That she was upset about the notion that --

A. Of course.

Q. -- that there had been some recording that she didn't know about?

A. Of course. No woman would ever want that.

Q. Okay. Are you -- were you aware when she reported that to the Leander Police Department?

A. I was. I heavily discouraged her not to because I'm horrified of my ex-wife to be honest.

Q. Okay.

A. And I wanted to just try to move on, but Pink is a very -- when she sets her mind on something, she's going to do it. So against my wishes, she went ahead with it.

Q. Okay. And I would think similarly with the lawsuit?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Were you aware of the lawsuit?

A. Of the lawsuit between Pink and Fream?

Q. Yes.

A. I was very aware. I heard about it every day.

Q. Okay. And that lawsuit is filed in June of 2024?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. You're aware of the allegations in the application for protective order?

A. Yes.

Q. Specifically an incident that is alleged to have occurred in March of 2024 and another incident that's alleged to have occurred May 28th or May 29th of 2024. And you're aware of the allegations in the application?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I want to ask you under oath, are those allegations true?

A. No, not even in the slightest.

Q. Did you ever forcefully engage in oral sex with Pink?

A. No, never once.

Q. Did you ever engage in oral sex without Pink's consent?

A. No. There was even a conversation about consensual nonconsent and I denied that because that

idea makes me uncomfortable.

Q. Okay. And just to be clear, in March of 2024, did you -- were you sexually abusive to Pink?

A. No, sir.

Q. And by Pink, I mean the applicant in this case, [redacted].

A. No, sir.

Q. Okay. I want to ask you under oath, in May, late May, May 28th or May 29th of 2024, were you sexually abusive to [redacted] or Pink?

A. No, sir.

Q. Okay. Have you ever been?

A. No, sir.

Q. Every sexual encounter that you had with Pink, was it consensual or nonconsensual?

A. It was very consensual.

Q. Okay. Were any nonconsensual?

A. No, sir.

Q. At some point, this relationship runs its course?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that fair to say?

A. Yes.

Q. Strike that.

So this lawsuit that Pink filed, she discusses how rumors and just kind of online chatter about this --

these alleged recordings that your wife had, how that was affecting her ability to get sponsorships, how it was affecting her ability to sign as quickly with Mythic Talent, things like that.

Did you see that in real time, how it affected her?

A. Of course. I spent the majority of my days when could, sometimes even cutting my own stream short, just to make sure that Pink was okay. You know, whether that was me or her family. Trying to make sure Pink was okay, that was kind of all of our priority.
I can absolutely vouch that, you know, with those recordings, it made things a little bit difficult because, you know, it was told to me, allegedly, that the recordings were sent to the heads of Mythic Talent. And, you know, Mythic Talent already saw that I had a history with my ex-wife and they were kind of hesitant on if I was going to date somebody new because, you know, they didn't want a repeat of that. And yeah, So it definitely did slow things down for her. Absolutely. But I attempted to help her in every step of the way.

Q. Was that stressful for her, going through that process?

A. I think it would be stressful for anyone. I felt for her. I felt horrible for her, because she trusted

me and I tried very hard to make sure she was okay. And I just felt like an idiot because she was very stressed, very scared, would go in her room and she would scream and wail and break things.

And it was very scary, but I didn't blame her because I understood. But yes, it was very hard for her. It was hard. The relationship was very good until the stress of the ex-wife, of course.

Q. And is it fair to say that that stress your relationship with her?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Things had been going good until February of 2024?

A. Yes.

Q. And is it fair to say that the investigation and the lawsuit, that that -- that kind of precipitated the relationship kind of falling apart?

A. Yes. Pink and I's relationship was very fun. We played games, we liked the same things, but when Pink is worried about something, it consumes her --

Q. Okay.

A. -- to where soon every conversation was just, Okay, I'll hear it again. And I knew it was scary, so I wanted to let her vent. And, you know, I would take her to the bathroom and I would sit her down and I would put

on the water for background noise to try to calm her down because that's what calmed me down.

Pink has a hard time expressing herself, so I would give her like a marker or a Crayon to, like, draw how she feels so I could easily -- more easily understand her. But yes, it made the relationship very difficult to where once making a lot of good memories just kind of became, Pink's a wreck and how do I, as a man, take care of her?

Q. And were you aware of some of the kind of mental health stuff going on with her?

A. Yeah.

Q. Okay. And --

A. Yeah.

Q. -- was that when you found out that she was going to Austin Oaks?

A. No.

Q. Was that something that you were supportive of?

A. I was blatantly aware of everything Pink had stressing her out, everything she was dealing with. You know, my previous partner had things they had to deal with as well, but I took it as, if I give up on this person, you know, who am I? When I have my own issues, who am I to give up on somebody because they have their own issues? So I tried helping her with it, sometimes

successful, sometimes not. But I gave it my all. And that's pretty much all a guy can do.

Q. Okay. When you broke up the first time --

A. Yes.

Q. -- did --

A. There was -- I want to clarify.

There was three times. Once, I believe, Pink has forgotten about. There was one where Pink wanted me to have -- try to have sex, and I swore to her that I would try. And I did, and it just didn't work. I was too afraid of committing vaginal sex. It's not a thing to take lightly. I'm not a guy that sleeps around. And it's -- you know, what if I get her pregnant? And also, you know, I'm not going to lie, the unfortunate reality is that I did have a fear of vaginas. It's still hard for me to look at vaginas. I'm a straight man, but something about them just scares me.

And so, you know, I -- you know, when I lost my virginity, I had to even close my eyes just to kind of go through the motions. Sorry. Am I rambling? What was the exact question?

Q. So the first time that you broke up?

A. Yes, okay. Sorry.

Q. Okay.

A. Yeah, there was the one time where she didn't get

--

Q. John.

A. Yes?

Q. Hold on.

A. Yes.

Q. So the first time that you broke up, did you break up with her or --

A. The first time -- sorry.

Q. -- did she break up with you or was it mutual?

A. Yeah, so the first time we broke up, I knew I had to do it. Some of my friends said, you know, you're not dating a girl at this point. You're dating a liability, because they knew how Pink was back in the day because they --

MRS. LOCKE: Judge, I'm going to object as to hearsay and move to strike.

THE COURT: Sustained.

THE WITNESS: Did I say something wrong?

Q. (By Mr. Puryear) You can't say something that somebody else said.

A. Oh, sorry. Okay, yeah, absolutely.

Q. So did you break up with her --

A. Yes.

Q. -- or did she break up with you or was it mutual?

A. It was -- we went to the closet and we sat down

on the floor and I initiated the breakup.

Q. John?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you break up with her or did she break up with you?

A. I broke up --

Q. Or was it mutual?

A. I believe it was mutual.

Q. Okay. The first time?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Let's talk about the second time.

A. Sure.

Q. The second time you broke up, did she break up with you --

A. She --

Q. Did you break up with her or was it mutual?

A. She broke up with me.

Q. Okay.

A. Yes.

Q. And that's the time -- strike that.

Is it fair to say that after you broke up, you continued to communicate?

A. Yep.

Q. Okay. Is it fair to say that after you broke up, you continued being intimate with each other?

A. Yep.

Q. Okay. Is it fair to say that after you broke up, you remained friends?

A. Tried the best I could, yes.

Q. Okay. Were things cordial?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay.

A. Cordial, yet a little bit uncomfortable, as anybody who breaks up with somebody would be.

Q. Sure. Complicated relationship?

A. Yep.

Q. You guys have been together for a year and a half?

A. And I'm not going to lie I was -- shortly after we broke up, I did become interested in another girl.

Q. Okay.

A. And so, you know, it made things a little bit complicated.

Q. Okay. And -- but you continued communicating with each other almost every day?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Was she still living there at your house?

A. There was talks for us to continue moving in to a new place together because our old residence, for lack of a better term, just kind of sucked.

Q. Okay.

A. So we were going to go to a new place all together as friends, but kind of foresaw that wasn't going to be possible if I wanted to have a new partner. So me being, you know, 30, 31, I don't really have too much time to waste in my eyes, so we decided to not -- or more so I decided that we should not live together.

Q. Okay. And she moved out?

A. Yes.

Q. Was this before or after Austin Oaks?

A. To the best of my knowledge, I believe it was shortly after. Yes, no, it was shortly after Austin Oaks her assistant helped her move out.

Q. I want to ask you about -- I want to fast forward to November 20th of 2024.

When did you first find out about Pink's tweet?

A. I found out probably before it was even posted. I heard rumblings from some of my friends that something was going to be posted.

MRS. LOCKE: I'm going to object as to hearsay.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q. (By Mr. Puryear) And again, John, you can't say what somebody else told you.

A. Sorry.

Q. Were you made aware of --

A. Yes.

Q. -- that tweet at some point?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay.

A. Very quickly after the posting.

Q. How quickly?

A. Almost instantly.

Q. Okay. I'll -- so that tweet was on November 20th, 2024. Did you find out about it on November 20th, 2024?

A. Yeah, I saw it after it was posted and it was a lot to take in. And then yeah, that is when I found out about it or at least when I saw it.

Q. Okay. Did you start receiving messages online about that tweet?

A. Within three hours, the heads of my company told me that I'm going to be --

MRS. LOCKE: Objection to hearsay.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q. (By Mr. Puryear) John, listen to the question I'm asking.

A. Sorry.

Q. That day, did you receive messages --

A. Yes.

Q. -- about Pink's tweet?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Very good.

MR. PURYEAR: Judge, may I approach?

THE COURT: You may.

MR. PURYEAR: Any objection?

MRS. LOCKE: Other than authenticity, nothing.

THE COURT: You do not have an objection?

MRS. LOCKE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And this was Respondent's?

MR. PURYEAR: This will be Respondent's 5.

THE COURT: All right. Respondent's 5 is admitted.

MR. PURYEAR: And Judge, at this time, I'll also offer what's been previously provided as Respondent's 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10.

MRS. LOCKE: They're the same ones?

MR. PURYEAR: Yeah.

MRS. LOCKE: Are we duplicating? I thought we already agreed to these.

MR. PURYEAR: No, only 5 was admitted.

THE COURT: Are those --

MRS. LOCKE: Oh, I don't have any

objections.

THE COURT: Okay. So Respondent's 6 through 10 are admitted.

MR. PURYEAR: Thank you, Your Honor.

Q. (By Mr. Puryear) So John, you started receiving messages, you said almost instantly, about the tweet?

A. Instantly.

Q. Okay. Did you have the opportunity to see Pink's tweet?

A. I saw Pink's tweet and I thought, Damn. I sure hope this doesn't turn into anything. And then it slowly, but surely, then very quickly became a very big thing.

Q. Okay. But you saw it?

A. Yes, I saw it.

MR. PURYEAR: Okay. And Judge, we'll offer Respondent's 11.

THE COURT: All right.

MRS. LOCKE: No objection.

THE COURT: Respondent's 11 is admitted.

Q. (By Mr. Puryear) And John, when you -- when you saw this tweet, and we've talked about it a lot, did you have any doubt who this was talking about?

A. No. Pink has had a history of vague sub-tweeting is what it's called on the Internet.

Q. Okay.

A. She did it a lot to my ex, and so then I saw this. Oh, God it's happening to me now.

Q. John, was it well known to your followers that you were dating Pink?

A. It was blatantly obvious.

Q. Okay. Would you -- when you say it was blatantly obvious, what do you mean?

A. I mean, she would dress up as random characters, you know, we would stream together, I would be on like every single one of her streams. You know, when she would have an anxiety attack, I would be like, Are you okay? Like, we'll take care of the stream, everything's going to be okay. It was -- it was pretty much as clear as mud --

Q. Okay.

A. -- for anybody to see.

Q. Okay. It was well known to her followers she was dating you. It was well known to your followers that you were dating her. Is that --

A. I would like to clarify for all fairness.

It was very clear to my followers. To her followers, maybe not so much. But to mine, yes, very apparent.

Q. Okay. And did your followers knew -- know when

the relationship had run its course?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So again, when you saw this tweet, did you have any doubt that she was talking about you?

A. No, there was not a single doubt in my mind.

Q. All right. And in that vein, now we're talking about Respondent's Number 5, did you start to get messages as -- almost as soon as Pink's tweet went up?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And is Respondent's 5 an accurate characterization of the types of messages that you would receive?

A. They were way worse than that. That one's more of a, you know, like a get shit on post, but yeah. That was a -- a lot worse than that.

Q. Okay. And are these, Respondent's 6 and 7 -- and we see in Respondent's Exhibit 7 there's a hashtag TECTONE?

A. Yep.

Q. With a post date, it looks like of November 21st, 2024?

A. Yep. That one of -- the one previous, that was before the hashtag went from TECTONE to hashtag rapetone is my new name on the Internet instantaneously. Yes, being called a rapist and a pedophile was very frequent.

Q. And on Respondent's Exhibit 6, it looks like it looks like underneath your shirt, there's a 2M. What does that represent?

A. 2M means two million views.

Q. Okay. So this post, there was two million views?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Looking at Respondent's Exhibit 8, this was posted at 10:49 a.m. on November 21st, 2024. And how many views did it have?

A. That has 37,000 views, which is one of the smaller ones.

MRS. LOCKE: Judge, the only thing I'd like to point out is there's no indication of when these pictures were taken, these screen shots, to know that at the time on November 21st there were actually that many views. So I don't think that's --

THE COURT: Agree.

MRS. LOCKE: I think that's a mischaracterizations of the evidence before the Court.

THE COURT: I think that goes to the weight, not necessarily the admissibility.

MRS. LOCKE: Correct.

Q. (By Mr. Puryear) And let's talk about Respondent's Exhibit 9. Let's talk about that. How many views did it have?

A. That had 2.1 million views.

Q. Okay. And that was posted when?

A. Before I responded, so that was about -- I think I responded some time around like 5:00 a.m. on the 22nd because I go to sleep. So yeah, this was about 26 hours before then.

Q. Okay.

A. So almost immediately after. Maybe like what? 12 hours after Pink posted?

Q. And I want to -- there's been some questions from the applicant about the timing of these views --

A. Of course.

Q. -- and when that traffic happened. When eyes were on --

A. Yeah.

Q. -- the allegation against you from Pink.

What is this that we're seeing in Respondent's Exhibit 10?

A. Well, this is a great one because this shows you exactly how many live people were watching the day of the 21st. As you can see on the bottom there, it says, noon, TECTONE sexual assault allegations. And as you can tell, the viewer count, judging by the green graph, is going up.

If you notice, the peak is at 12:00 to 12:50,

which is when Denims changed their stream title to the TECTONE SA allegations. And her, amongst many other streamers, were all live streaming that, including Mike from PA from a previous screen shot, and leveraging viewers to come and react to it live on the 21st before I had said anything.

Q. And what do we see on the second page of Respondent's 10?

A. Yep, this is another stream where the real live time viewers are there. It was a four-hour stream. And as you can tell, the moment that TECTONE SA allegations is going to be covered, that yellow font is the indication that the stream title was changed to that. And as you can tell, the interest is at an at all time high for that individual stream, which is Denims, who is in the top 500 streamers in the entire world out of, I believe, seven million.

Q. Okay. So is it fair to say that when you responded on November 22nd, 2024 to the false allegations that Pink had made in her tweet, is it fair to say that there was a substantial amount of understanding and knowledge about the accusations against you?

A. Not only was there a substantial knowledge for anybody who is Twitter savvy, it was also trending on

Twitter and the United States. So yes, everyone was talking about it, which is why it forced me to respond, as well as the owners of my company decided to let me go as well because of the allegations.

Q. Was it -- was Pink's tweet a secret or in a small sphere of knowledge or influence when you responded or had it kind of already gone viral?

A. It went viral very quickly, as well as the multiple articles, as well as the multiple Twitter accounts that were covering it due to those. To Pink's benefit, that is her alternate account. But an alternate account does not prevent a tweet from going viral, and that tweet very much went viral and the Internet ran with it very quickly.

Q. Okay. On November 21st, did you receive news about your future employment, future prospects with one of your business entities?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And what was that?

A. OTK decided they had to let me go. They had two previous members, one of them being Rich Campbell who had sexual assault allegations who did not get to prove his innocence until three years after; as well as another streamer by the name of Mizkif, who also had sexual assault allegations and his is still kind of up

in the air. So people were ready to run with the ball of, Look at that. Another streamer from this org is a piece of shit.

Q. And you were let go?

A. Instantly. I would like to say much to OTK's benefit, they were very kind. They didn't put out a statement because they just wanted to move past. They said, Thank you, TECTONE, for being a part of us. We will not renew your contract. And I echoed the same sentiments. I said, Yep, I enjoyed my time and we departed.

Q. Okay.

A. But OTK was --

Q. The next day, John, on November 22nd, when you responded in your stream, if Pink's tweet hadn't been sent, hadn't been released online, would you ever have mentioned this situation between you and Pink?

A. Of course not.

Q. Okay. Why is that?

A. Well, if somebody isn't attacking me, then there's not really any reason to attack them.

Q. Okay.

A. Self defense.

Q. And did all of that change on November 20th, 2024?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Would you receive messages threatening you?

A. Oh, yeah.

Q. Okay.

A. Yeah.

Q. Would you receive dozens? Would you receive hundreds? Would you receive thousands?

A. I know it's kind of hard for someone who is not plugged in to quantify this, but tens of thousands daily. Not just messages, but, you know, messages to my face on, like, my stream as well as people in real life. Many a times -- thankfully, I am a bigger guy, so I was able to feel a little bit safe. And I did admittedly just stop going out for a while; but yes, the messages were constant. And to be honest, they still are.

Q. Okay. You still receive threats?

A. Yes.

Q. Threatening your life?

A. Yes, I've even had a SWATing attempt on me as well.

Q. Okay.

A. Someone somehow got my address, I don't know how, and they told me I had children upstairs and that I was raping them. And so --

MRS. LOCKE: Judge, I'm going to object as to hearsay.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MRS. LOCKE: Thank you.

Q. (By Mr. Puryear) Do you still receive threats

A. Yes.

Q. -- about your life?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. For the last five months, have you had any firearms in the house?

A. No, sir.

Q. Can you protect yourself?

A. No, sir.

Q. Okay. Do you continue to receive threats from people online?

A. By the hour.

Q. John, have you called Pink since the application for a protective order was filed?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you e-mailed Pink?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you messaged Pink in any way?

A. No, sir.

Q. On any social media channels?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you direct messaged her?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you sent her letters?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you gone by her house?

A. No, no plans. Nope.

Q. In fact, did you move?

A. I moved, yes, just to get away from everything. moved to San Antonio, in specifics Fair Oaks --

Q. Okay.

A. -- which is about two hours away.

Q. Have you attempted to contact her in any way?

A. Nope.

Q. And since that application for a protective order was filed, have you discussed this situation with specificity? Have you used her name?

A. Have I used her name in specificity in recent memory? Over what time period?

Q. Well, let me put it this way.

A. Yep.

Q. Pink made an allegation against you?

A. Yes.

Q. From your perspective, that tweet was about you and accusing you of the things that are in that tweet?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that fair?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you defend your innocence?

A. Of course.

Q. And did you absolutely make statements online that the truth would come out?

A. Absolutely, of course.

Q. Okay. Did you ever threaten Pink with any kind of physical violence?

A. No, of course not.

MR. PURYEAR: I'll pass the witness, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mrs. Locke?

MRS. LOCKE: Thank you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MRS. LOCKE:

Q. Mr. Robertson, did you ever engage in vaginal intercourse with my client?

A. No, ma'am.

Q. Okay. And did you ever engage in any -- did you perform any oral sex on my client?

A. No, ma'am.

Q. Okay. And in fact, the only one that received any kind of sexual satisfaction was you from her. Is that correct?

A. Direct, yes; but she would, obviously, pleasure herself while doing this, which --

Q. Oh.

A. Yeah.

Q. Okay. So in the romantic relationship you had, would you consider that the only person actually getting physical sexual contact from the other partner to be a normal one, like what you had with her?

A. Unfortunately, in my mind it was normal. That's how my previous relationship was as well, so I thought it was just normal. My shortcomings are unfortunate, but I would have if I thought I had the capability to be a better partner. But I would admit I was a selfish partner sexually. Absolutely.

Q. And did, in fact, you not kiss her or make out with her?

A. That's not true.

Q. Oh.

A. We kissed quite often.

Q. Okay. And did you request to spit in her mouth on occasion?

A. No, ma'am.

Q. Okay. And so it is true then when she said that you did not satisfy her in any way orally. Correct? That was correct?

A. No, I did not use my mouth upon her. No.

Q. Okay.

A. Besides kissing.

Q. And you did not even use your hands to touch her vagina. Isn't that correct?

A. No, ma'am.

Q. You did?

A. Oh. No, I did not use my hand.

Q. Okay. And in fact, none of -- like, your hands did not ever go under her pants. Is that correct?

A. I would grab her butt.

Q. Okay. Over the clothes or under the clothes?

A. Under the clothes.

Q. Okay. And that was the extent of it. Is that right?

A. I think the closest furthest we ever went for me trying -- because I did try. She would wear underwear and I would put my penis near her vagina to see if I could remain hard, it just would not work. We tried our best, but it just wouldn't work.

Q. So it was -- so her comments about you -- having to give you blow jobs was accurate, that is truthful. Right?

A. I did appreciate them, yes.

Q. Okay. And in fact, on times, you would demand

them. Correct?

A. No, ma'am.

Q. Okay. Isn't it true that you have posted on social media that it's hot when girls have their lips done with filler for blow jobs?

A. Yeah, of course.

Q. Okay. And in fact, you've said on social media that you can't go too hard on them when they first get their lip fillers done because it causes problems with the filler. Correct?

A. I'm not familiar with that comment, but perhaps. I wouldn't say that I didn't say that.

Q. Okay. And, in fact, your exact statement on February 5th of 2025, so after these allegations were made is, Lip fillers, they do make your lips look fuckable as shit, but the problem is anyone who has lip fillers cannot suck a dick worth a damn. It sucks because if they suck it too hard, it'll fill up -- fuck up their lip fillers. Is that correct?

A. Yeah, I became very familiar with the flaws with lip filler.

Q. Okay. Have you ever also said online, after you were made aware of these allegations by my client, that you are one of the only streamers who has had a documented blow job machine?

A. Pinkchyu did describe herself as a blow job machine, yes.

Q. Okay. Well, you were actually on your stream on February 3rd of 2025 actually stating, I am the only one -- I am -- sorry. Let me start that over again.

I am one of the only streamers who has had a documented blow job machine. Is that correct?

A. Yes. I was attempted to make light of the situation.

Q. You're making light of someone accusing you allegedly of sexual assault?

A. Yeah, because if I take it too serious, then everybody's going to think that it's real. And when you're in a self-defensive mode, you kind of got to say, you know, anything you can to save face because when people are calling you a rapist every day, I mean, you got to let it roll off the shoulder or make it a joke.

Q. And so the best way to defend yourself is to make the other person basically a whore. Correct?

A. I don't believe that's the best way to do that.

Q. Well, that's what you've done. I mean, the first thing you said when you testified today was that she was the most forward woman that you have ever had in your life on the day one?

A. I don't think calling someone forward is calling

them a whore.

Q. Really? When you talked about you said you like long tongues and she exposed her tongue, you thought that was appropriate behavior?

A. It was probably inappropriate. That's probably what made it attractive maybe though, I'm just not used to it.

Q. Okay. So do you not see that you are painting her in a particular light when you talk about these things in open court?

A. I can only give you an accurate representation of the truth. If it makes someone appear a certain way, that's not really against -- or not really my intention. I'm just trying to give you an accurate representation of things how they happened.

Q. Okay. And so tell me this. Miss -- my client actually had a house that she was renting in South Austin at the time that she moved in with you. Is that correct?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. And she was actually making about $10,000 a month or so. Isn't that correct?

A. I don't think she was making that much. Was she making $10,000 a month?

Q. I'm asking.

A. Oh.

Q. Is it your understanding that she -- because you have testified that she didn't have money. That's why she needed to move in with you. Correct?

And I need to slow down. I'm sorry.

A. Did I testify to that? I thought I just said she didn't enjoy her house and so she wanted to move in.

Q. Okay. And so she actually broke her lease --

A. Uh-huh.

Q. -- to move in with you. Is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And there was actually not a bunch of roaches. There was one roach and you-all made it a joke to tell people that there were roaches all over the house when there was only one?

A. Oh, okay.

Q. Is that correct?

A. That could be correct. It's been so long that I just accepted that as what it was. I thought she had more roaches.

Q. Well, wouldn't that be different than what you actually told the law enforcement officer? Remember the detail you just went into a minute ago --

A. Yeah.

Q. -- about the police stop on the way?

A. She called because there were roaches.

Q. Okay. And then you had her sell all of her furniture from her rental house?

A. Yep.

Q. Okay.

A. Well, I wouldn't say I had her do that, but that definitely happened.

Q. Okay. So -- and you also, at the time of the lawsuit, you wanted her to sign an NDA because you didn't want all of your ex-wife's allegations public. Isn't that correct?

A. Can you repeat that? Sorry.

Q. Sure. We talked about the lawsuit. Correct?

A. Of course.

Q. And you tried to paint it that you were not involved in it. In fact, wanted nothing to do with it. Correct?

A. I tried my hardest to not be a part of it; but obviously, when Pink was worried about it, I tried to assist her.

Q. And, in fact, what was the attorney's name that handled that case?

A. I'm actually not familiar.

Q. Aaron? You don't remember Aaron?

A. No, I'm not familiar with Aaron.

Q. Okay. Are you familiar with Alex Conant?

A. Not familiar with that guy either.

Q. Okay. And you're not originally -- you weren't originally behind the lawsuit when it started, but after you-all broke up is when you withdrew your support of that litigation?

A. One more time? Sorry. Trying to make sure I understand you clearly.

Q. Sure. You were actually on my client's side, [redacted]'s side, on that lawsuit up until the time you-all broke up when you withdrew your support of that lawsuit?

A. Yes. I tried to support Pink with whatever she needed.

Q. And in fact, what your concern was was not whether she should do it or not. You were concerned more about the NDA language and some violation of that that may possibly involve you. Correct?

A. I -- my intentions were to kind of just assist Pink. I mean, obviously I think if I can toss myself a bone in those situations, I'll do it. But I mean, it's mainly just about Pink, you know, being okay.

Q. Okay. You are -- you would agree with me, as you've indicated, that it's important to be honest with your viewers. Correct?

A. Of course.

Q. All right. And you have told your viewers that you are schizophrenic. Correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And you, in fact, suffer from schizophrenia. that right?

A. If by "suffer" you mean diagnosed, yes. I wouldn't really consider it suffering.

Q. Well, who is your mental health provider that tells you this information now?

A. My mental health provider was just like a psychiatrist from New Mexico State University back in freshman year. And I just said, Hey, sometimes I think I see things that aren't there. And he goes, You're schizophrenic, take these pills.

Q. Well, wait a minute. You've said on your stream, the Court's heard it --

A. Yeah.

Q. -- that you are schizophrenic and that you have hallucinations once a month. Is that correct?

A. Yeah.

Q. And you are telling this Court under oath that you are not seeking mental health treatment for a serious mental health condition?

A. It's very much under control. I mean, the worse

that I'll really get is like, you know, like Pink said, I'll see a face and it's like -- you know, it looks like it's melting.

Q. And you think that's okay, to go without medical supervision for that?

A. My experience with medication kind of turned me into a zombie and almost got me to end my own life. So I kind of fear medication because the last time I attempted to O.D.

Q. And are you aware of the consequences of being an untreated schizophrenic?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Are you aware that being untreated can lead to worsening psychosis, including hallucinations and delusions?

A. I'm sure a more severe case of schizophrenia could absolutely do that.

Q. Well, but tell me this, are you a licensed medical professional?

A. No, ma'am.

Q. Okay. So how would you know how serious or not your case of schizophrenia is?

A. I guess it's kind of goofy. There's this movie called *The Beautiful Mind*. And so I was like, Man, his is messed up and mine is nothing compared to that. So,

you know, I hear people, like, who, like, talk to people who aren't there. But I'm just like, What's that? Oh, it's gone.

Q. Okay. Are you aware that it can lead to chronic -- you can have neurobiological deterioration from not getting treatment for schizophrenia?

A. I can absolutely believe that.

Q. Okay. Are you aware that medication and therapy can significantly reduce your psychoses and allow for better functioning?

A. Yeah, I absolutely believe that.

Q. Okay. So what medication are you currently taking?

A. Just -- I just take multivitamins and fish oil, so nothing.

Q. Okay. And what therapy are you doing to help reduce your psychosis and allow for better functioning?

A. No therapy, ma'am.

Q. Okay. When was the last time you sought therapy?

A. With a registered professional? I don't recall. I don't believe I've ever. Just kind of just, you know, just checking in with my homies and seeing if I'm okay and talking about my problems. That's about it.

Q. Okay. Are you aware that one of the challenges of schizophrenia is lack of insight by the person

suffering from schizophrenia?

A. I actually did not know that.

Q. Okay. And that people with schizophrenia often don't realize they are ill, making them resistant to treatment. Are you aware of that?

A. No, I was not aware of that.

MRS. LOCKE: Okay. Judge, may I approach?

Q. (By Mrs. Locke) All right. We're going to look at this one first. You've indicated that you were immediately called a pedophile and a rapist. Correct?

A. Yep.

Q. And that was a direct result of the comments made by my client on her sub-account. Is that correct?

A. Yes, ma'am.

Q. And would you tell me where, on the threads you're looking at, will you tell the Court what exhibit number that is you're referring to? The one with her tweet.

A. Am I referencing a picture?

Q. Yes, yes.

A. Okay. So --

Q. What exhibit number is that?

A. Exhibit 11.

Q. Thank you.

A. Yep.

Q. Now, tell me where on there she refers to you as a pedophile.

A. Oh, nowhere.

Q. Okay. Did you hear my question where I just asked where you said you were blaming her for them calling you a pedophile or a rapist the very next day?

A. When someone's okay with calling you a rapist, they're not going to draw the line at pedophile or abuser. Because once you kind of open the gateway of, like, Hey, this guy's a rapist. Is anybody even going to fight him on, Well, he's a rapist, but I wouldn't say a pedophile. People will just -- it opens the floodgates. They're going to call me anything they want now.

Q. Okay. And you believe that even though my client never referred to you as a pedophile, it's her fault that you were called that?

A. Once you get a guy called a rapist, I don't think there's anything worse than that, so might as well just add more on to it.

Q. You think molesting children is not nearly as bad as being called a rapist?

A. It's absolutely terrible.

Q. Okay. Let's talk about -- give me one second, Judge.

So let's just go over a couple of -- you can't -- those sub-tweets that you were getting and receiving in the days after, those actually don't show anything the same day as her tweet. Isn't that correct?

A. Yeah, it's not on the 20th, correct.

Q. Okay. So your testimony was that you received it within moments of it being published on the Internet was incorrect. Right?

A. No, it was correct. The tweets that I pulled were kind of just, like, last second. I could probably dig more, but I haven't dug. I maybe dug for, like, 15 minutes.

Q. Wait a minute. This has been on file since August. You've known about this since at least your video on November 21st of 2024. And you're telling this Court under oath that you only spent 15 minutes to dig up these just for court today?

A. Yes.

Q. And do you remember getting online and telling all of your followers that you had all the evidence back in November of 2024 and you were ready to produce it all?

A. Of course.

Q. Okay. So where are those messages from 2020 that show -- or from November 20th, 2020 that showed --

sorry.

November 20th, 2024 that show that you immediately received notifications of her post?

A. Notifications are obvious. They got to be from moderators first in a discord as well as calls from the higher ups in my company. And then the bigger tweets started to pop up the day of. I'm not really sure. Maybe you can refresh my memory exactly what time this was posted on November 20tth.

Q. And you've indicated that you get -- have gotten death threats. Is that right?

A. Of course.

Q. And these death threats are specifically related to the issues with Pink. Is that correct?

A. It definitely had a big snowball effect.

Q. Okay. And so do you blame the current death threats that you were getting, are they a direct result of my client's statements back in November of 2024 on her sub-account?

A. I would absolutely say they were one of the root causes, as well as an exacerbation.

Q. Okay. So it doesn't have anything to do with your current white privilege comments and propaganda and racist towards whites. That has nothing to do with your death threats. Is that correct?

A. So if I can explain on that? When all of these things came out, I lost pretty much a large chunk of my audience. And content creators kind of have to pivot what they're doing to other topics once they lose access to a demographic. So originally, I never really covered anything political or talking about, you know, white privilege. But yeah, I would say my content definitely had to find a new route on how to be successful online. And so unfortunately, I had to make a little bit more extreme comments to be successful in the career that I'm in now.

Q. Well, and that's as recent as of October 2025, that you were making statements with regards to white supremacy and people being racist against white people. Is that correct?

A. Just to make sure, are you saying that I'm a white supremacist?

Q. I'm asking you about your post was regarding.

A. What did I say?

Q. Okay. Let's talk October 28th, 2025. So I think -- who is Valkyrae?

A. Valkyrae, she's like a very successful content creator dating one of the largest leftist political content creators in the world.

Q. Okay. So yes, I can't say her name. Valkyrae,

if you treat someone different or assume someone's past is based on their race, that's racist. Yes, even to white people. Is that correct?

A. Yeah, for seem reason the Internet believes that if you judge someone based on their skin color, it's bad unless you're white. And then it's okay. So I've talked about that briefly on the Internet. Well, maybe a little bit more than briefly at this point.

Q. And you refer to Hasan, who is another streamer, as a terrorist supporter and a dog abuser. Correct?

A. Yeah, he electrocuted his dog on stream and he says Hezbollah was doing a good thing. And I don't think supporting terrorism is a good thing, nor is abusing your animals.

Q. White privilege is propaganda the real racists have been using to be racist towards whites for things they never did for decades.

You posted that October 27th of 2025. Is that right?

A. That sounds like something I posted.

Q. Okay. But the death threats are -- originated because of my client's post where she didn't name you in November of 2024. Is that right?

A. Yeah, you can check the timestamps on the threats if you like.

Q. Okay. How about your stance on trans children? Has that gotten you death threats?

A. Of course.

Q. Okay. So that didn't come from my client. Correct?

A. Correct, but those are far after this whole ordeal happened.

Q. Okay. But upon questioning from your lawyer, you blamed my client for these death threats?

A. Yeah, they're -- well, for the ones in regards to me being a rapist, of course. Why wouldn't I?

Q. Okay.

A. I don't think people like rapists too much.

Q. Okay. And I think just kind of to wrap things up, you originally talked about being authentic with your audience. And you, unfortunately, have had a sexual assault experience yourself. And I'm sorry for that.

A. Thank you.

Q. And it's okay for you to talk about that experience with your public. Is that right?

A. Of course.

Q. So then why is it okay for you to talk about your experiences, but my client not talk about her experiences when she doesn't name you?

A. Well, one, because it didn't happen; and two, because everybody knew who she was referring to.

Q. Okay.

A. As you can tell by the viral tweets.

Q. All right. And tell me this, did you ever make her write words on her face when you gave her a blow job?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And how many times did you record her?

A. A lot.

Q. Okay. And how many times did she tell you, No, I don't want to be recorded?

A. Never.

Q. How many times did she actually agree to be recorded?

A. Every time. She would even hold the camera.

Q. Okay. And tell me this, you made a reference, I thought this was interesting, about she tried to have a conversation with you about nonconsensual versus consensual and it made you uncomfortable so you didn't want to discuss it?

A. Oh. So she said she would be okay with consensual/nonconsensual because she was so forward about wanting to have vaginal intercourse. She told me that it would be okay if I just tried that while she was

sleeping, in which case I said, no, that makes me uncomfortable.

Q. Okay. And so did you tell her that if she wrote -- and what is it you had her write on her face?

A. I never had her write slut on her forehead.

Q. Oh.

A. But I did have her write "cum in here" with an arrow pointing towards her mouth.

Q. Okay. And did you tell her that in exchange for her doing, that you would attempt to have vaginal intercourse with her and you could have a normal relationship?

A. No.

Q. Okay.

A. That was just, you know, dressing up.

Q. I'm sorry?

A. That was just like dress up.

Q. And would that be -- like, that's a degrading thing to do to a woman. Is that correct?

A. Oh, no, she would frequently cosplay for me.

Q. Okay. And she would frequently degrade herself? Is that what you're telling this Court under oath?

A. I didn't mean to say that. I was just saying, you know, we would, you know, try different outfits just to see, how was that? You know, does this make things

exciting?

Q. How is an outfit the same thing as writing derogatory statements on someone's face to cum here?

A. I guess I didn't really see it as degrading. And it was also kind of both of our idea, just to make things more fun in the bedroom.

Q. So isn't that maybe the problem, Mr. Robertson, that she views what you did as nonconsensual and you just don't see it that way?

A. I think if I was ever informed a single time that things were uncomfortable or she didn't like what she was doing, I would immediately say, Well, then let's not do it. To be completely honest, I'm not really that much of a sexual guy.

Q. Okay. But that's not true. You actually would sit her down with a white board and go over everything to convince her that she was wrong. Right?

A. I'm failing to see how these two connect, but I don't understand what do you -- in what regard? We have talked with a white board before.

Q. Yeah, and you would use a white board to show her that she was wrong in whatever position she was taking, that you-all were disagreeing on. Correct?

A. Oh, if we were to have an argument, then we weren't seeing eye to eye. Visual aid really helped

her, as well as her to me.

Q. Okay. And do you know what coercive contro1 is?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And you told her that she had memory problems. Right?

A. I believe we have had discussions on her memory not being, you know, as sharp as a tack. Sure, I'm sure we've had conversations about memories.

Q. Okay. And because you believed that her memory recollection, because of what she is saying now is false and incorrect. Right?

A. Do I believe her current memory of what happened between us is incorrect? Yes, I do believe it's incorrect.

Q. Your ex-wife made some pretty awful allegations against you. Didn't she?

A. She did, but she admitted they were lies.

Q. Well, now, remember, you have an NDA. So...

A. Oh, it's in the court order.

Q. Okay. But you had some pretty serious allegations --

A. Yes.

Q. -- that she made against you?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. And that's -- and so you learned from that

marriage what can happen when false allegations -- well, not false. I don't know if they were true or not.

But you knew how to handle allegations like that from your first marriage. Correct?

A. I don't think I handled those pretty well. I think I handled those pretty bad.

Q. But you definitely knew how to handle it when you had my client in your house. Right?

A. I was kind of a mess when that happened, to be honest.

Q. Well, tell me this, how many times did you go with her to any of her therapy appointments?

A. I don't think I was invited.

Q. Okay. Did you tell her and tell her what things to tell her therapist to get prescribed certain medications?

A. I definitely tried to help her understand, you know, try to help her make sense of what's going on in her head. You know, she wanted to tell me, This is kind of happening to me. And I'd say, Well, maybe it's this. I definitely tried to help her in her journey to therapy and medication.

Q. And what pharmacological background do you have to give her any advice on medication?

A. I'm definitely not qualified, but I think any

partner would try to help their partner with their issues.

Q. But yet, you couldn't help yourself with your own?

A. Yeah, as a result of poor -- you know, poor experience with my own medication.

MRS. LOCKE: I pass the witness.

THE COURT: Mr. Puryear, anything else?

MR. PURYEAR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Robertson, you can return to your attorney at the table. Please call your next witness.

MR. PURYEAR: We rest at this point, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Both sides have rested.

MRS. LOCKE: Yes, Judge. I don't know if you want me to do attorney's fees by submission or testify to them. I got to pull up my affidavit.

THE COURT: You could testify to them if you don't mind.

MRS. LOCKE: Thank you. Do you want to swear me in or it's because I'm an officer of the Court?

THE COURT: You're an officer of the Court. Go ahead.

MRS. LOCKE: Thank you. Do you want me to stand or sit?

THE COURT: Either way is fine.

MRS. LOCKE: My name is Michele Locke and have been a licensed attorney in the State of Texas now this is my 24th year. I've been licensed since 2002. I'm in good standing in the State of Texas. I can't believe I just said 24 years.

I practice family law exclusively. I used to be a former associate court judge in family law and a former associate court judge for the Child Protective Services court. I actually also ran a protective order court. My -- it's a usual and customary rate for attorneys of my experience in this particular area, and I charge 650 dollars per hour, which is normal and customary for attorneys in Travis County with my

My associate, Caitlin Boland has been attorney now for two years. Three? Two and a half. And she is licensed and in good standing in the State of Texas. Her hourly rate is 300 dollars per hour, which is a usual and customary rate for an attorney with her experience in this particular area.

My paralegal is a board-certified family law paralegal. His name is Juan Diaz. And he has been my

paralegal now for the last ten years. His hourly rate as a board-certified paralegal is 225 dollars per hour, which is a usual and customary hourly rate for paralegals of his experience with his board certification. Total legal fees, not including -- what's today's date? The 23rd? So up until the end of yesterday when I stopped working last night, I think I had billed 12.2 hours for a total of 7,930 dollars.

Mrs. Boland, as of the end of yesterday was at 2.6 hours for a total of $780. Mr. Diaz, who does a good chunk of the work, has done 17.1 hours at $225 per hour for a total of 3,847 dollars and 50 cents. If we include the total through yesterday, it would be 12,557 dollars and 50 cents. If we include the time for today that we are now calculating, total time for me would be total of 4,225 dollars.

For Mrs. Boland, it would be $1,950 for a total of 6, 175. I'm not including my paralegal for today. I know he's done some work, but I can't figure it out, nor testify to it. So we'd ask for a judgment, if the Court grants a protective order, for 18,732 dollars and 50 cents for the handling of this application for protective order. And I have Applicant's Exhibit 46 to introduce, which is my applicant attorney's fees exhibit with the redacted

billing statements for the Court.

THE COURT: All right. And that would be Applicant's, you said, 46?

MRS. LOCKE: I think it's 46. Do I have another 46? Okay. Thanks, Judge.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. PURYEAR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: 46 is admitted. All right. Now, both sides have rested?

MRS. LOCKE: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. PURYEAR: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm going to give each side an opportunity to briefly close. We'll begin with you, Mrs. Locke.

MRS. LOCKE: Thank you, Judge. I think what has happened today is a reason why more victims of sexual assault don't come forward. What she has had to go through exemplifies why it is so difficult for victims to come assert their rights, because they get painted as liars, as overly aggressive women, as women with boob jobs and lip filler and everything done to degrade them as an individual person as opposed to listening to their story.

I think that it is terrifying that we have someone who has been diagnosed with schizophrenia admits

to delusions of at least once a month and goes untreated. While he may not have firearms in his possession right now, because I don't think he can under the current temporary protective order, the concern is what happens when you've got an unmedicated person who is schizophrenic, diagnosed schizophrenic, doesn't get treatment, has admitted to his fans himself that he becomes paranoid and that he sees things? I mean, he saw her face melting according to her testimony.

I don't -- I think her story's believable. I think it is concerning, and I think that Mr. Robertson misses what went wrong. I do believe some of the acts were nonconsensual. I do believe that the testimony is credible with regards to that. If the Court looks at the medical records that were introduced, it shows that she went for [redacted] in May and then had to go get it dissolved back in September, several months later, which coincides with the timing of the incident as testified to and put forth in her declaration.

We think it is appropriate in this particular case to grant a protective order because just what occurred. You saw him ramp up, threaten to go nuclear, said, We're going to war and kept escalating and talking about her, talking about the case, talking about issues until that August date. And then he, as

he's own testified, hasn't bothered her, hasn't texted her, hasn't done anything. Why? Because the protective order served its purpose.

I mean, to me, that is proof in the pudding that my client absolutely needs the protective order for a period of time that the Court determines appropriate so that these parties can go to their separate corners and go live their lives without any further concerns for repercussion online for their -- especially for my client, for her respective earnings.

So we'd ask respectfully that the Court grant the protective order and award the attorney's fees as requested.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mrs. Locke. Mr. Puryear?

MR. PURYEAR: Thank you, Your Honor.

Judge, quite simply I realize the Court has heard testimony from the applicant. I realize that the applicant has put on statements by Mr. Robertson the Court may or may not find objectionable, but to get to the crux of why we're here, and that is the applicant's position that she was the victim of sexual abuse, that she was harassed online.

The Court has objective documentation ratified by the applicant herself that those things are

not true. She had every opportunity to tell Officer Hoffman with the Leander Police Department when she was investigating an alleged documentation of these intimate encounters and didn't make any disclosure about being the victim of sexual abuse. Further, she had the opportunity in this lawsuit that she filed and she -- the Court has this in evidence, that she characterizes the idea that she was a sex slave, that she was being groomed, that those were disgusting lies, that they were not true. And then further, when she is -- when she admits herself to Austin Oaks because she's experiencing -- I know she disagrees with this characterization -- but what I think is reasonably an acute mental health crisis.

When she is concerned about self harm, when she checks herself in, they ask her not once but twice about any history of sexual victimization. And keep in mind, this is within days, weeks of according to her this last incident of brutal, oral sexual assault. And when asked, Have you been sexually victimized, not sexually assaulted, with elements of the offense and this and that, have you been sexually victimized at all in the last six months, she answers no.

Now, she could be forgiven for overlooking the question, just wanting to get through as quickly as

possible except that on the very next question, when they asked, have you ever been sexually victimized, her answer is yes, in a relationship six years ago proceeding when she even knew Mr. Robertson. She clarified this was not somebody that was just checking boxes, moving through their intake process. She was careful, she was complete in answering those questions. The Court can take solace knowing that that was her answer. And I think it's reasonable when she finally admitted that part of her motivation in tweeting about this situation was to make people aware of it. Of course it was. It's on Twitter. That is what it's there for. Social media. It's in the name. It is social, it is interactive, people are meant to see it. That's why we post things on social media.

I think it's reasonable in John's situation to defend himself against those accusations online. Now, what's good for the goose is good for the gander. The applicant can't say, Because I didn't use his name in that original tweet, I'm all good. I realize John hasn't done the same thing, but it's clear to everyone that that's what he's talking about. I realize that names haven't been used; but again, Your Honor, it is clear, it is apparent to everyone who is reading these messages, John and hers alike, what they're talking

about.

But I think looking back to who started this in the public discussion, it was not John. It was the applicant with that original tweet on November 20th, 2024. That's what started the snowball going. So the position is it is disingenuous to kind of throw this grenade out in the public discussion and then say, You're not allowed to defend yourself. You're not allowed to say, The truth is going to come out. You're not allowed to say, I look forward to defending my innocence.

That is disingenuous, it's intellectually dishonest. For all of those reasons, Your Honor, we are respectfully requesting the Court to look at the documentation, to look at the physical evidence that the Court has in front of it. And again and again she has stated that these are just not true, that this didn't happen. And we're going to encourage you to deny their request for a protective order understanding that this -- this is a situation that is going to affect John for the rest of his life.

I get their request and desire to deny him firearms. That is not the standard. The standard is not, Do we want to deny this person of firearms? It is did they meet the criteria of the statute? And when we

look at that, he didn't. And we're requesting respectfully that the Court deny that protective order.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mrs. Locke?

MRS. LOCKE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: No? Okay. Thank you. All right.

Based on the testimony and the evidence that's been provided to the Court, the Court does find that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the applicant is the victim of sexual assault. The Court makes the additional finding, that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the applicant is the victim of stalking and will grant a ten-year protective order. It will expire at midnight January 23rd, 2036 and will contain the terms and conditions that have been requested by the applicant. And attorney's fees in the amount of 15,000 dollars will be awarded to the applicant. What I want to say, Mr. Robertson.

THE RESPONDENT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: You are not allowed to have any contact with her in any manner whatsoever. That means no contact through phone calls, e-mails, mail, text messages, any kind of social media, any kind of communication with her through third parties. All of that is prohibited. You can only communicate with her

through attorneys.

In addition, you are to stay 200 yards away from her and any address where you may know her to be including her residence, her workplace. If you run into her outside of those locations, you need to turn around and leave even if you got there first.

THE RESPONDENT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: She cannot give you permission to violate these orders. If for some reason, within the ten-year period, she calls you or she communicates with you that she has changed her mind and it's okay for you to come by her residence, it would not be a valid defense to a criminal charge of violation of protective order that she gave you permission to come over because only a judge or a court can change or modify this protective order.

In addition, you are not to be in possession of any firearms or ammunition while this order is in effect. I am going to ask that you relinquish any firearms in your possession within 24 hours to law enforcement and provide a receipt of relinquishment to Mrs. Locke within 48 hours. If you do not posses or own any firearms, as you testified to, then you may provide a sworn affidavit indicating as such. And that also needs to be provided to Mrs. Locke within 24 hours.

THE RESPONDENT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: I'm also going to order you, and I don't know that you specifically asked for this Mrs. Locke, but you are not to disseminate or reproduce or share any kind of photograppic or electronic or digital media that is a recording of this applicant. And I think you know what I'm talking about. It's been referenced many times during this proceeding. That is completely prohibited.

THE RESPONDENT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Was there anything else, Mrs. Locke, that you were requesting?

MRS. LOCKE: The only reason is because it's Friday. Can we make him do everything on Monday?

THE COURT: That's fine.

MRS. LOCKE: And I can get an order to the court on Monday, but I need a copy of the specific ruling so I can put it in the ruling.

THE COURT: Okay. Just -- and that's fine.

We could take care of the actual order on Monday, but just so you understand, just because you don't have a physical order in your hand does not mean that these orders are not in place. They are currently in full force and effect. This protective order is valid and enforceable not just here in Travis County and

in Texas, but across all 50 states. So no matter where she moves, no matter where you move, it is valid and enforceable until January 23rd, 2036. Thank you. We're off the record.

(Court's in recess.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

THE STATE OF TEXAS)

COUNTY OF TRAVIS)

I, Gabriela S. Silva, Deputy Court Reporter in and for County Court at Law No. 4 of Travis County, State of Texas, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing contains a true and correct transcription of all portions of evidence and other proceedings requested in writing by counsel for the parties to be included in this volume of the Reporter's Record, in the above-styled and numbered cause, all of which occurred in open court or in chambers and were reported by me.

I further certify that this Reporter's Record of the proceedings truly and correctly reflects the exhibits, if any, admitted by the respective parties.

I further certify that the total cost for the preparation of this Reporter's Record is $2,260.00 and has been paid in full by Attorney Rom Bar-Nissim.

WITNESS MY OFFICIAL HAND this the 29th day of January, 2026.

/s/ Gabriela S. Silva
GABRIELA S. SILVA, CSR RPR CRR RMR
Exp. Date: Jan. 31, 2027
Travis County, Texas
509 W. 11th St.
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 854.9676